THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF PROTESTANT SEMINARIANS

by

Philip Lee Berg

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Sociology

Under the Supervision of Dr. Alan P. Bates

Lincoln, Nebraska

July, 1968

TITLE

THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF PROTESTANT SEMINARIANS

BY

Philip Lee Berg

APPROVED	DATE
Alan P. Bates	June 24, 1968
Clyde Z. Nunn	June 24, 1968
Preston Holder	June 24, 1968
Keith L. Broman	June 24, 1968
Harry J. Crockett, Jr.	June 24, 1968

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to a number of persons and organizations for their contributions to the completion of this research. Dr. Dwight Culver, Chairman of the Sociology Department, St. Olaf College, generously consented to the use of his data on seminary students and offered a number of useful suggestions in the planning stages of the study. Dr. Herman Turk, formerly of the University of Nebraska, provided a number of invaluable ideas in the formulation of the theoretical framework for the research problem. Dr. Alan P. Bates willingly assumed the role of advisor during the early stages of analysis, and provided pertinent criticisms and capable direction in the preparation of this report. Other members of the Department of Sociology, members of my committee, and colleagues also offered helpful comments at various stages of this research. The writer expresses his gratitude to the Board of College Education, Lutheran Church in America, and to Dr. Kenneth Underwood of the Danforth Foundation for financial assistance which greatly facilitated the progress of the study.

To my wife, Janice, and to my children, Wendy, Stephen and David, a special acknowledgment is due. Without their confidence, patience and understanding, this study would probably still be in the planning stage.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. iii

LIST OF TABLES. vi

CHAPTER

I. THE THEORETICAL CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM. 1

Adult Socialization 1
Professional Socialization. 7
Bureaucratic Organization and Professionalism 18
The Protestant Clergyman as Professional and Bureaucrat 28
Religiosity and the Socialization of Clergymen. . . . 40
The Nature of Theological Education 47
Organization of Religious Group and Professionalism in Leadership. 51
Withdrawals from Seminary Training. 58
Statement of Problem. 61
Statement of the Hypotheses 62

II. CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS. 64

The Source of Data. 66
Selection of the Sample 67
Working Definitions of the Major Variables. 71
The Selection of Indicators of the Major Variables. . 74
The Assignment of Scores. 81
Methods of Testing the Hypotheses 85

III. THE FINDINGS

Length of Training and Degree of Professional Socialization. 93
Sons of Clergy vs. Other Seminarians. 110
Curricular Emphasis and Professional Socialization. . 121
Independent Seminaries and Denominational Seminaries. 126
Internal Consistency of Professional Socialization Variables. 130
Social Prestige of Denomination and Professional Socialization. 133
Professionalism and Withdrawals from Training 139
Summary of the Findings 147

IV. AN INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY 149

BIBLIOGRAPHY 174

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Number of Seminaries Selected and Percentage of Response Rates. 70

2. Mean Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficients for the Indicators of the Variables of Professional Socialization 82

1-A. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Charismatic Orientation (By Seminary). 96

1-B. Differences in the Scores of First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Charismatic Orientation (By Denomination). 97

1-C. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation (By Seminary). 99

1-D. Differences in the Scores of First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation (By Denomination). 100

1-E. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Intrinsic Religiosity (By Seminary). 102

1-F. Differences in Scores of First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians in Intrinsic Religiosity (By Denomination). 103

1-G. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation (By Seminary). 105

1-H. Differences in Scores of First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation (By Denomination) 106

I-I Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Bureaucratic Orientation (By Seminary). 108

Table | Page

1-J. Differences in Scores of First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Bureaucratic Orientation (By Denomination) 109

1-K. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Extrinsic Religiosity (By Seminary) 111

1-L. Differences in Scores Between First-Year Seminarians and Third-Year Seminarians on Extrinsic Religiosity (By Denomination) 112

2-A. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians on Charismatic Orientation. . . 114

2-B. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians on Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation 115

2-C. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians on Intrinsic Religiosity. 117

2-D. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians on Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation. 119

2-E. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians on Bureaucratic Orientation 120

2-F. Differences in Scores Between Sons of Clergymen and all other Seminarians in Extrinsic Religiosity. 122

3-A. Ranking of Seminaries by Professionalistic Emphasis in Curriculum. 124

3-B. Rankings of Seminaries by Professionalistic Emphasis on Curriculum and by Professional Socialization Variables 125

3-C. Rank Order Correlations Between Professionalistic Emphasis of Curriculum and Professional Socialization Variables 127

4. Differences in Scores on Professional Socialization Variables between Students in Denominational Seminaries and Students in Independent Seminaries 129

5-A. Intercorrelations Among the Variables of Professional Socialization 131

Table Page

5-B. Mean Intercorrelations of the Four Positively Correlated Variables of Professional Socialization (Based on Table 5-A). 132

6-A. Professionalism Scores of Denominations and Composite Professionalism Scores. 135

6-B. Ranking of Denominations by Professionalism Scores and by Social Prestige in U.S. 137

7-A. Ranking of Seminaries by Rate of Withdrawal From Training 140

7-B. Rank Orders of Seminaries by Withdrawal Rates and Professionalistic Emphasis of Curriculum. 141

7-C. Rank Correlation Coefficients Between Withdrawal Rates and Professional Socialization Variables, for First-Year and Third-Year Groups (Based on Data from Table 3-A) 143

8-A. Rankings of "Disparity" Between Professional Emphasis of Curriculum and Professional Socialization Variables, for Both First-Year and Third-Year Groups of Seminaries . 145

8-B. Rank Correlation Coefficients of "Disparity" and Withdrawal Rates from Training, by Variable and by Year of Seminary Training. 146

CHAPTER I

THE THEORETICAL CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM

The central focus of this study is upon the effects, in terms of changes in value-orientations, of the professional socialization of Protestant seminary students. These seminarians are representatives of ten major denominations in the United States, and comprise the vast majority of the first-year and third-year "degree-seeking" students in their respective seminaries. The construction of the theoretical framework for a research problem of this nature involves analysis of four relatively distinct bodies of sociological theory, including (1) adult socialization, (2) the sociology of occupations and professions, (3) formal organizations and (4) the sociology of religion. The major task of this chapter, then, will be the critical review of research efforts done within the confines of these four areas which seem to be especially relevant to the objectives of this study. The chapter will conclude with the statement of the hypotheses, which, it is hoped, will have been firmly linked to the theoretical framework.

Adult Socialization

The concept of adult socialization has, until quite recently, been neglected by behavioral scientists. The most sophisticated efforts to account for personality change such as those of Freud and Sullivan follow the child's path of development to the point at which he is about to become an adult. At that point the theories come to an abrupt halt and seem to imply that whatever personality changes might occur in adulthood will be only inconsequential variants of earlier development.[1] Many sociologists have been sharply critical of the traditional psychological theories of personality, arguing that such explanations are excessively individualistic, physiology-bound and childhood-determined. The formulations which have proved most acceptable to sociologists have arisen from such sources as symbolic interactionism, "culture and personality" studies by anthropologists and "Neo-Freudian" psychology. All of these approaches can be said to share at least one element in common--namely, a "situational" approach to personality. A number of researchers have noted the far-reaching effects of such factors as one's statuses, roles and reference groups upon the individual's behavior at any given time. These studies have been concerned with such problems as the "conditioning" effects of poverty, the influence of economic affluence on American "national character," the effects of prejudice and discrimination on minority group members, the psychological consequences of modern business organization and the effects of occupation on personality.[2]

"Identity," said Erikson, "is never gained nor maintained once and for all."[3] Frequent and momentous changes, in terms of passage from one status to another, are characteristic of adult life. Many such passages are institutionalized, so that the individual moves through them in an orderly sequence. In various ways the person is prepared for what is to come and is reminded of his transition from one status to the next. Such transformations in status often involve not only changes in actions, but also changes in the "reasons" for such changed actions. Motivations that were suitable for previous, lower statuses tend to be cast aside in favor of newer, more "appropriate" motivations.

---

[1] Anselm Strauss, Mirrors and Masks (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959).

[2] William Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1956); also Maurice Stein, Arthur Vidich and David M. White (eds.), Identity and Anxiety (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960).

[3] Erik Erikson, Childhood and Society (New York: Norton and Co., 1950), p. 57.

This process was illustrated by Arensberg and Kimball in their description of family transition in Irish peasant culture.[4] The marriage of a son brings about a sudden transformation in status, action and motivation, necessitating adjustments to drastically changed role requirements which involve every member of the household. Not all transformations are as neatly institutionalized as family role transition in Irish peasant culture. Some changes might occur outside of, and even in spite of, influences from the major social institutions. Drastic transformations of identity are probably rare, but when they do occur tend to be accompanied by a psychological reorientation in which the individual develops a new set of values and new criteria for judging himself and the world. Traumatic experiences such as military combat, losing a fortune suddenly, or becoming a parent for the first time all result in changes in self-conceptions which, in turn, are accompanied by changes in interpersonal relationships.

The phenomenon of "conversion" has generally been associated with a religious experience. Transformations in perspective can, however, take place in a variety of contexts. A study of the Mormon missions in Rimrock, New Mexico, found that the Indians who were converted to Mormonism were those who, for whatever reason, failed to fit into Navaho social life. Some were young people who wanted to identify themselves with dominant American culture, and others were women who were discontent with their subordinate social roles.[5] Even orthodox psychoanalytic theory, through the process of unraveling childhood experiences, implicitly concedes the possibility of personality change in the adult. Burke referred to successful psychoanalytic therapy as "secular conversion" in the sense that the patient is persuaded to redefine himself from a new standpoint. He contends that psychoanalysts have created their own symbolic environment, complete with a special "vocabulary of motives," which enables the patient to alleviate his stress by attaching new labels to his faults--a process Burke terms "exorcism by misnomer."[6] Before the patient can be persuaded to accept a new perspective, an interpersonal tie must be made between patient and therapist--a process known as "transference." The therapist becomes the significant other who teaches the patient a new outlook and then supports it. A recent and very interesting theory called "logotherapy," founded by the Austrian psychotherapist Viktor Frankl, holds that a patient's attitudes can be changed, not by a lengthy recounting of childhood experiences, but rather by persuading the patient to perceive his current situation from a new vantage point.[7] This existentialist psychotherapy, although arising entirely outside of a sociological framework, is nonetheless a clear recognition of the importance of the immediate interpersonal situation in effecting significant personality changes.

---

[4] Conrad M. Arensberg, The Irish Countryman (Magnolia, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1937); and Conrad Arensberg and S. T. Kimball, Family and Community in Ireland (Magnolia, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959).

---

[5] Robert N. Rapoport, Changing Navaho Religious Values, in"Reports of the Rimrock Project: Value Series No. 2," Vol. 41, No. 2. (Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1954).

[6] Kenneth Burke, Permanence and Change (Los Altos, Calif.: Hermes Publications, 1954).

Brim has argued that there are really no deep personality characteristics which persist across any and all situations.[8] Kallen expressed a similar view, asserting that "personal accounts of progress uncover no single pattern, no straight inevitable line, developmental or other. They speak of regressions and other shifts of interest and direction."[9] If a person is a transient rather than a permanent participant in a social situation, his perspectives can be expected to shift with his movement. This was shown by Wheeler, who observed that prisoners tend to become more "prisonized" the longer they were in prison, but when they approached their time of release they became increasingly law-abiding.[10] The inmate finds that the values which would put him in good stead in the criminal community are simply not practicable on the outside. To imply, however, that values are purely situational in character would be unjustifiably extreme. One might argue, for example, that in Wheeler's study the prisoners' behavior reflected no real change in values, but rather a tactful bit of role-playing by persons forced into a highly restrictive social situation.

---

[7] Viktor E. Frankl, Man's Search for Meaning (New York: Washington Square Press, 1963).

[8] Orville G. Brim, Jr., "Personality as Role-Learning," in Ira Iscoe and Harold W. Stevenson, (eds.), Personality Development in Children (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960), pp. 127-159.

[9] Horace Kallen, Patterns of Progress (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), p. 26.

[10] Stanton Wheeler, "Socialization in Correctional Communities," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXVI, No. 2, pp. 697-712.

The process of situational adjustment helps to account for much of the change which an adult undergoes as he encounters shifting social and psychological demands during the course of his life. Yet it is common knowledge that human behavior is not so flexible as to be totally chaotic or random. There tends to be, in other words, a thread of consistency in a man's behavior as he passes from one social role to another. Some sociologists have used the concept of "commitment" to account for this consistency.[11] Although a person may engage in a wide range of seemingly disparate actions, it is likely that he perceives these acts as fundamentally integrated and consistent with his pursuit of certain goals. Adulthood may thus be seen as a period in which a person gradually acquires a variety of commitments which constrain him to follow a relatively consistent direction of behavior throughout his lifetime. Certain events, such as the choice of an occupation, finding a wife or having children tend to produce comparatively lasting commitments and thus constrain a person's behavior. The concepts of commitment and situational adjustment are complementary to the extent that one's immediate situation is perceived as having definite connections to anticipated future situations.

The processes relating to adult socialization which have just been discussed were introduced ~~in order~~ to set the stage for a more detailed analysis of one of the chief avenues of adult socialization--

---

[11] Howard S. Becker, "Notes on the Concept of Commitment," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVI, No. 4, (July, 1960), pp. 32-40.

namely, socialization into an occupation or profession.

Professional Socialization

The term "profession" has undergone a process of secularization. Originally the term denoted the process of taking the vows of a religious order, but by 1675 the term had been secularized to refer to an occupation whose practitioners were "duly qualified."[12] Hughes writes that "profession" has come to mean: "The occupation which one professes to be skilled in and to follow. . . . A vocation in which professed knowledge of some branch of learning is used in its application to the affairs of others, or in the practice of an art based upon it."[13] Professionals profess to know better than their clients what ails them, and in exchange for this esoteric knowledge they ask to be trusted. Every profession considers itself the proper group to set the terms by which some aspect of life or society is to be defined.

Professions in general have tended to retain a greater measure of "vocation," in the sense of a "calling," than have other kinds of occupations. Vocations refer to occupational situations in which the individual's work is felt to encompass his whole life, and to provide him with an inner sense of obligation to be highly proficient in that calling. In early American history there prevailed the Calvinist belief in the Divine Calling to be industrious, efficient and productive in whatever the occupation. The degree of the worker's worldly success was viewed as an indicator of God's approval and promise of future bliss.

---

[12] Everett C. Hughes, "Professions," Daedalus, Vol. XCII, No. 4, (Fall, 1963), p. 656.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 656.

The idea that one's decision to enter an occupation is highly significant, if not irrevocable, was clearly supported by religious ideology. Today, even though the Protestant Ethic seems to be largely stripped of its theological connotations, occupation as a calling tends to persist among those classed as professionals, and particularly among clergymen.

Goode has described the profession as a "community within a community."[14] Though lacking a physical locus, the professional community shares certain characteristics with other kinds of communities. These characteristics include the following: (1) Its members are bounded by a sense of identity; (2) Once an individual is in the community he is not likely to leave. Thus his status tends to be a continuing one; (3) Its members share common values; (4) Role definitions *vis a vis* both members and non-members are agreed upon; (5) There is a common language, only partially understood by outsiders; (6) The community has power over its members; and (7) It exerts control over the selection of professional trainees, and through its training process it sends the recruits through an adult socialization process.[15] Goode cites the clergy, along with the medical and military professions, as the three professions "which almost isolate their recruits from important 'lay' contacts for several years, furnish new ego-ideals and reference groups, impress on the recruit his absolute social dependence on the profession for future advancement, and punish him for inappropriate attitudes or behavior."[16]

In a study of three groups of graduate students, in the fields of engineering, physiology and philosophy, the researchers noted that there are various mechanisms tending to produce changes in the identity of the graduate student, and to direct him toward the proper identification with the profession.[17] Among these mechanisms are the development of problem interest and pride in new skills, the acquisition of the professional ideology and the internalization of motives. These mechanisms are implemented by the individual's participation in organized groups, which in turn affects his experience and, hence, his self-image. Such changes in participation are the result of "movement into the orbits of three groups --the informal peers, the apprentice relationships with professors and the formal academic structure of the university, with its grades, credits and degrees."[18] Each such movement, the authors conclude, generates particular kinds of experiences for the individual, thus creating a potential for change in the development of occupational identification. The movement into the formal academic structure by matriculation as a graduate student represents an "investment of an irreplaceable quantum of time in a particular career . . . and not to follow that career means a loss of investment. It is a first step up a ladder."[19] This applies, state the authors, only where the general cultural expectations stress age-graded mobility (as in America) and where movement out of the academic structure entirely would prove costly in this respect.[20] In being placed into classroom contact with men who teach materials as "problematic" rather than as fact, the student's interest in these newly perceived problems is aroused. New work techniques are presented, and the student is confronted with the challenge of mastering them. Constrained in this way by the school situation, the student acquires these skills as well as the interests which they presuppose. Thus he becomes associated, in the eyes of others, with the particular work identity which these skills and interests symbolize.[21] The student's future depending at least partially on how others will identify him, "he is pushed in the direction of assuming the identity that goes with his new interests and skills so he can satisfactorily meet the expectations of others in the world of work."[22] The mechanism of development of interests and the acquisition of skills therefore operates to create identification in the area of "task commitment."

---

[14] W. J. Goode, "Community Within a Community," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. XXII, (April, 1957), pp. 194 ff.

[15] *Ibid*., p. 194. [16] *Ibid*., p. 196.

---

[17] Howard Becker and J. W. Carper, "Development of Identification Within an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LIV, No. 4, (January, 1956), p. 289.

[18] Ibid., p. 292. [19] Ibid., p. 294. [20] Ibid.

During the course of his professional training, the student raises questions, or has them raised for him, pertaining to the "worth" of the activity in which he is engaged. The answers are provided for him by the professional ideology. By interacting with the older students and the professors he comes to accept these answers for his own use. The internalization of motives seems to operate primarily in clique and apprentice relations.[23]

The process of professional socialization occurs, then, in various phases, in each of which various aspects of the profession's "cultural content" and self-identification are in the process of formation. These phases have been described as follows: (1) the individual's attention shifts from the broad, societal goals which originally led him to choose the profession in the direction of mastering proficiency in particular work tasks; (2) he finds new significant others in his work milieu who become his major reference group; (3) he internalizes the values and performs the proper behavior of the professional group.[24] A growing number of sociological studies are finding support for Hughes' assertion that the novice in professional training has "lay" conceptions of that occupation which are based on generalized societal values.[25] The first phase of the professional socialization process, generally speaking, seems to be focused upon the desire to transform this "lay" conception into the more "technical" orientations of the true professional. This task is usually accomplished by the professional school's emphasis on the mastery of a body of quite specialized knowledge and skills. It is made plain to the initiate that his professional status depends on his willingness and ability to master the requisite skills. Thus, theoretically at least, the self-conception of the student changes so that it coincides more closely with the cultural content of the professional role.

---

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 296. [22] *Ibid.*, p. 297. [23] *Ibid.*, p. 298.

The "lay" conception of the profession which the student brings with him to training is invariably one which could be described as "idealistic," "humanitarian," "altruistic" or "reformist." The "fate of idealism" in medical training is thoroughly documented in Becker and Geer's instructive study.[26] They observed that freshmen medical students entered training with the idealistic notion that medicine is a "wonderful thing," something which can be devoted to the service of mankind. Disillusionment quickly sets in when the student realizes that his first year is "just another year at college taught by Ph.D.'s who know nothing of the practice of medicine." Little or no contact with actual patients is included in the freshman's program. The student does begin to see, however, that there is some obvious value in learning "what the faculty expects." The second year of training is not greatly different in content from the first. The training in the third and fourth years, however, takes a radically new turn. The students now concentrate almost entirely on living patients, for whom they make diagnoses. The faculty then subjects the student to a sort of constant quizzing about the wisdom of his diagnosis. The students had hoped that these final years of training would be the realization of their fond idealistic hopes. Instead, they are working with "cases" as medical problems. This "forced" preoccupation with the technical aspects of the case leads to the withering away of the lay attitudes, "in favor of those more relevant to the way the event affects someone in his position."[27] Cynicism overtakes the student. This process is well-known to the teachers of medicine, who sometimes rephrase the distinction between clinical and pre-clinical years into one between the cynical and pre-cynical years.[28]

---

[24] Ida H. Simpson, "Patterns of Socialization Into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, Vol. XXXVII, (Winter, 1967), pp. 47-54.

[25] Everett Hughes, "The Making of a Physician," Human Organization, Vol. XIV, (Winter, 1955), pp. 21-25.

[26] Howard Becker and Blanche Geer, "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, (February, 1958), pp. 50 ff.

From this point on, the patients are discussed in terms of the problems they raise for the student. "Patients with terminal diseases who are a long time dying are viewed as creating extra work without extra compensation in knowledge or opportunity to try out new skills."[29] Interestingly enough, however, the observed cynicism seems to be only a

---

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 54. [28] *Ibid.*, p. 50. [29] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

"situational" phenomenon; idealism has not yet breathed its last. The group of students, acting collectively, function to constrain the student in two ways. First, in group activity there is no mention of lay idealism, even though it may be present in the members of the group, individually; and second, the group members are "less likely to have deviant thoughts like this when engaged in group activity."[30] When an individual is removed from this group of colleagues, however, he reasserts some of his old idealism. As the end of training approaches, idealism of a new sort emerges. A professional dimension has been added to the original idealism. This is indicated by their intention to "examine patients thoroughly to arrive at a firm diagnosis--not just treat symptoms."[31] This transformed idealism occurs at the time when the student chooses his field of specialization. It is interesting to note that this study provides evidence to suggest that idealism is not "killed" by professional training; it is only "set aside" temporarily in favor of the more expedient goal of getting through medical school, and subsequently re-appears, transformed.

Other studies of the socialization of medical students add to Becker and Geer's findings. Bloom found evidence that attitudes of medical students appear to change in the direction of cynicism. When interpreted in the full context of the student's experiences, however, the apparent cynicism can be regarded as a form of training in "detachment," which is a vital attribute of the M.D.'s role.[32] In another study of the motivations and socialization of medical students, Reissman and Platou classified two groups of students--juniors and seniors--into three motivational categories or types. The first was termed "Scientists," which included those students whose chief interest in medicine was in its scientific research aspects; the second was labeled the "Professionals," and comprised those students who "saw the (socioeconomic) rewards in medicine."[33] The final category was the "Humanitarians," characterized by the motivation to help people. The junior class in the study were most often classed as "humanitarians;" the seniors were more equally divided among the three classifications. As might be expected from other studies of medical students, the authors found that the humanitarians had the most difficulty adjusting to the hospital routines, whereas the "professionals" were credited with knowing best what to expect. Seeman and Evans, focusing upon the year of the student-physician's internship in their study of attitude changes, generally agree with the previous studies as to the nature of the socialization of the medical student. They suggest the possibility, however, that perhaps the greatest degree of professional socialization occurs in the year of the internship, the year in which the student has become a physician "of sorts" but a physician-in-training.[34]

---

[30] Ibid. [31] Ibid.

[32] Samuel Bloom, "The Process of Becoming a Physician," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. CDXLIV, (March, 1963), pp. 77-87.

The fate of humanitarianism or idealism among student nurses has also been analyzed in a recent study. Like the medical students in the

---

[33] Leonard Reissman and Ralph Platou, "The Motivation and Socialization of Medical Students," Journal of Health and Human Behavior, Vol. I, No. 3, (Fall, 1960), pp. 174-182.

[34] Melvin Seeman and John Evans, "Apprenticeship and Attitude Change," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVII, No. 4, (January, 1962), pp. 365-378.

Becker and Geer study, the student nurses, without exception, indicated that their choice of the nursing profession was motivated chiefly by the desire to serve suffering people.[35] Also reminiscent of the medical students is the fact that the freshmen nurses were disappointed to learn that the whole first semester was to be devoted to academic work. They had expected to immediately begin learning practical techniques of alleviating human suffering. When the basic nursing program began, in the second semester, the desire to develop "nurturant" relationships with patients was paramount in the minds of the nurses. Instead, the needs of individual patients was subordinated by the nursing faculty to the mastery of special skills in following routines and procedures. Student nurses were not permitted to carry out tasks in which they had not been formally instructed, no matter how simple the task might seem to be. For example, one student nurse was not allowed to move a patient in a wheel chair, in spite of the patient's request, because she had not yet received her professional instruction in wheel chair-pushing.

During the two semesters of basic nursing, there was a shift observed from a humanitarian concern with patients as individuals to a concern with mastery of techniques. This was evident in the casual, off-duty conversations among the students. Instead of talking about Mrs. Jones' unfortunate family life and her resultant condition, she now became a most "challenging patient." Talk about the suffering of a patient was replaced with talk about the rarity or seriousness of his illness.[36] The first year-and-a-half of nursing school, then, proved to be sufficient time to notice the change from the desire to become a nurse in order to help others to the desire to be regarded, above all else, as a nurse.

---

[35] Ida Harper Simpson, op. cit., p. 3. [36] Ibid., p. 4.

In a study of socialization into the law profession, Lortie reports that Hughes' thesis "that professional education involves the replacement of stereotyped images by more subtle, complex and even ambiguous perceptions of the professional role finds support" in his data.[37] Broadly speaking, an exotic, dramatized image of the role of the lawyer gives way, during professional training, to a very routine image of that role. The original impression of the beginning law student is highly theatrical. In Lortie's words, "The image is a prism of potent American values--courage, association with the right, pragmatic brilliance and human motives of no less power. Perhaps the crucial attribute of the image is its charismatic rather than routine quality. It is the antithesis of the prosaic."[38] Apparently this image is not significantly diminished or modified during the course of training. The glamorous connotations of the image seem to persist until the graduate's actual first-hand contact with legal work. This kind of contact is seen as necessary to bring the "full recognition that law work is mundane, laborious and not necessarily idealistic."[39] The conclusion of the study suggests that "laymen become lawmen only partially in law school and that the important transformations take place in the hurly-burly of work after graduation."[40]

---

[37] Dan Lortie, "Laymen to Lawmen," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. XXIX, No. 4, (Fall, 1959), pp. 364 ff.

[38] *Ibid.*, P. 365. [39] *Ibid.* [40] *Ibid.*, pp. 366-67.

Turning now to the social work profession for another example of the shifts in the trainee's orientations, it is clearly evident that humanitarian sentiments are at variance with professional norms in social work. Typical of other professionals, the social work student comes to professional school "imbued with a desire to help people, and from the school he wants training in the techniques of help."[41] But he, too, is distressed to discover that the ways by which clinical therapy is expressed are quite foreign to those which spring from an inner desire to be of help.

> The humanitarian in him would bind the wounds directly; the professional clinician, he is taught, explores the wound with seeming indifference to the pain. The humanitarian would meet the need as expressed; the clinician teaches that expressed needs are rarely the real ones. The humanitarian takes people at face value; the clinician is sure that faces are but masks for deeper drives that must be probed. The humanitarian, feeling that all men are brothers, offers friendship to those he succors; the clinician knows he must maintain social distance from those he would help.[42]

Despite this rather imposing array of basic conflicts in orientations, one recent study demonstrates that the shifts from humanitarian to clinician in graduate schools of social work does seem to occur--to some extent at least. Using the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values test, Fuller found a steady convergence of values between students and faculty in the social work school of the University of Southern California. Second-year students resembled the faculty in values held more than did the first-year students, and the values of doctoral students in social work were almost identical to those of their faculty.[43]

---

[41] Harold Wilensky and Charles Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958), p. 322.

[42] Ibid., p. 322.

Bureaucratic Organization and Professionalism

Veblen was among the first to call attention to the relationship between occupation and personality, though very little work was done in this connection until Merton's well-known article was published, in which he explored the relationships between bureaucratic structure and personality. He tried to show that Veblen's concept of "trained incapacity" has special application in describing the "bureaucratic personality."[44] Merton pointed out that bureaucratic structure encourages strict adherence to rules and regulations for their own sake, even where the organization stresses the need for a certain amount of flexibility in the application of its rules. Thus the social worker, for example, fearing the risks involved in making a decision on his own, may play it safe by adhering to the letter of the law so devotedly that the intended spirit of the law is thereby thwarted. Organizational policy is glorified to the extent that the needs of the client are bent to fit it. Procedures, therefore, instead of being viewed as simply means to the realization of goals, are transformed into goals themselves. This line of reasoning can be traced to the writing of Michels who argued that the original goals of an organization tend to become distorted, the phenomenon known as the "displacement of goals." Michels' argument, briefly, is that when an organization displaces its goal--that is, substitutes for its original goal some other goal for which it was not created--it is due mainly to the existence of interest groups formed within the organization, whose chief concern is the preservation of the organization itself rather than the achievement of its initial goals. In his study of the socialist parties and labor unions in Europe prior to World War I, he referred to the process by which the established leaders, who became anxious to maintain themselves in office, controlled the means of communication within the organization and brought about either the absorption or the purging of young and ambitious leaders. Through this process, which he called the "Iron Law of Oligarchy," the democratic goals of the organization were subverted. Organizations with radical, revolutionary goals became quite conservative in their outlook.[45]

---

[43] A. D. Fuller, "The Values of Social Workers," Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XXIII, No. 12, Part I, (June, 1963), p. 4779.

[44] Robert Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Forces, Vol. XVIII, 1940, pp. 560-68.

Subsequent studies indicate the occurrence of goal displacement in a wide variety of organizational settings. Clark's study of the Salvation Army in Canada revealed that as the organization grew larger and more successful in gaining membership and funds, the leadership came to devote an increasingly large share of its time and resources to the maintenance of the organization. It gave up its traditional evangelistic activity in those areas where the local financial support was insufficient to maintain a chapter of the organization.[46] Selznick has also provided some insight into the displacement process. He suggests that in running an organization, problems are generated which have no necessary relationship to the original goals of the organization. The daily routine of the group comes to revolve about specific kinds of problems which have only

---

[45] Robert Michels, Political Parties (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949).

[46] S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948).

"internal relevance." As time passes, these activities assume greater significance as they consume greater proportions of members' time and energy, thus becoming substituted for the professed goals. The members become "fixated on internal problems, thus turning the organization in upon itself to the degree that it no longer serves its original purpose."[47]

Two questions suggest themselves at this point: (1) What is there about bureaucracy which leads to the "trained incapacity" of the individual? and (2) What is the relationship between the goals of the bureaucrat and the goals of the organization? As for the first question it seems clear that the displacement of goals presupposes an increased emphasis on system maintenance. The greater the tendency of the organization to emphasize system-maintenance, the greater will be the tendency to evaluate individual members on the basis of their contributions to "efficient" or "rational" system maintenance. This emphasis on maximum efficiency of operation, in turn, leads to a greater degree of specialization of labor within the organization. As specialization increases, the tasks assigned to individual members become more and more remotely associated with the "total product" or the "larger purpose" of the organization. Since the individual member is being evaluated on the basis of his performance within this highly restricted scope of activity, he is not likely to concern himself with other kinds of considerations. Thus the trained incapacity of which Veblen wrote.

In regard to the second question, Mannheim has suggested the term

---

[47] Philip Selznick, "An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy," American Sociological Review, Vol. 8, No. 1, p. 48.

"self-rationalization," a pervasive phenomenon in a bureaucracy, and one which helps to explain the congruence which often occurs between the goals of the bureaucrat and those of the organization. To quote Mannheim's words:

> By self-rationalization we understand the individual's systematic control of his impulses--a control which is always the first step to be taken if an individual wants to plan his life so that every action is guided by principle and directed by the goal he has in mind. . . . Modern society attains its highest stage of functional rationalization in its administrative staff, in which the individuals who take part not only have their specific actions prescribed but also have their life-plan to a large extent imposed in the form of a career in which the individual stages are specified in advance. Concern with a career requires a maximum of self-mastery since it involves not only the actual processes of work but also the prescriptive regulation of both ideas and feelings that one is permitted to have.[48]

Self-rationalization, according to Bensman and Rosenberg, appears when the official begins to see himself as a merchandisable product which must be marketed like any other product. After weighing his assets and liabilities in the personality market, the bureaucrat has the necessary data for remodeling his personality. Old habits are discarded, and new habits are nurtured. The bureaucrat is described as one who learns to "simulate the proper emotion at the proper time," dresses fashionably, is seen with the "right" people and in all his interpersonal relations is carefully attuned to others.[49] "The drive for self-rationalization implies nothing less than adult socialization, or in the majority of cases, radical re-socialization."[50] The "external" standards or those highly visible aspects of behavior which are relevant to the operation of bureaucratic organization, are strongly emphasized. One consequence of self-rationalization as a technique for control of personality is that, according to Bensman and Rosenberg, "the poseur may find that he is a different person. With much practice, 'control' becomes unnecessary; the bureaucratic mask becomes the normal face. . . . Functionaries are then, in the fullest sense, Organization Men."[51] Many writers have noted the sense of impersonality, isolation and powerlessness which the bureaucratic official experiences in his job, the causes of which are attributed to the high degree of specialization and the purely "status" relationships with others. A common response to this sense of impersonality and isolation is "over-identification."[52] An example would be the lowly clerk in a large organization who speaks knowingly of the high-level policies and planning of the organization, implying by the use of pronouns such as "we" and "our" that these policies and plans are his policies and plans, and that somehow he had something to do with their formulation. Another form of over-identification consists of a rigid adherence to rules. The outsider sees this as pointless obstructionism. To the bureaucrat whose identity has been "lost" in the large organization, however, such things as precise, fixed rules might well represent a source of security not otherwise available to him. The actual relationship between bureaucratic structure and personality is, however, very much an open question. The negativistic aspects of bureaucracy have been stressed in analyses by social scientists, although it is certainly within the realm of possibility that an argument for certain positive aspects of bureaucracy could likewise be made.

---

[48] Quotation from Karl Mannheim in Joseph Bensman and Bernard Rosenberg, "The Meaning of Work in Bureaucratic Society," Stein, Vidich and White, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 183-84. [50] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

---

[51] Ibid. [52] Ibid., p. 188.

Whether good or evil, however, there can be little doubt that bureaucracy is becoming increasingly pervasive in American society. Mills asserted that "professions are becoming more like businesses, and businesses are becoming more like professions."[53] There is a significant trend, he notes, "for the bureaucratic organization of businessmen and professionals to turn both into bureaucrats, professionalized occupants of specified offices and specified tasks. It is certainly not in terms of pecuniary vs. service or in any terms of motivation that business and the professions can be distinguished."[54] The difference then is not between egotistic self-interest versus altruism, but, as Parsons observes, in the entrance requirements in regard to specialized training. There are also differences in the way that professional groups and business groups are socially organized and controlled, and in the sanctions and rules governing the internal and external relations within each group.[55]

The functionary in a bureaucratic organization is not only trained to be a loyal and efficient member of the organization but in many cases he is also trained to act in a "professional" capacity. In many respects, however, the professional mode of organization is fundamentally opposed to the bureaucratic mode. Francis and Stone believe that the professional mode of organization stems from the relation of the individual to a specialized type of work. The professional principle implies a group of individuals involved in carrying out a special activity in which high skills are wielded and where the major goal is "service" either to a clientele or a public. As a consequence of long training and indoctrination with a "code," members of the group are considered individually responsible. As a result, heavy emphasis is placed upon colleague relations in which the individuals are equal.[56] An example of the nature and significance of colleague relations in the profession of social work is given by Wilensky and Lebeaux:

---

[53] C. Wright Mills, White Collar (New York: Oxford Press, 1951), p. 137.

[54] Ibid., p. 238. [55] Ibid.

> The colleague group expects the social worker to be alert to the unconscious motivation of overt acts, to display his knowledge of the deeper causes of behavior and to do this in a way that will remind everyone he is part of the fraternity. As one caseworker put it, "You're not one of the crowd if you let a Freudian slip go by unnoticed."[57]

The contrasting principles in the professional and the bureaucratic modes or organization have been summarized in the following way:[58]

Bureaucratic Mode Requires:	Professional Mode Requires:
1. Centralized leadership	1. Leadership of expertness
2. Emphasis on procedures	2. Variability of procedures
3. Simplification of tasks	3. Totality of tasks
4. Little initiative	4. Broad initiative
5. Corporate responsibility	5. Personal responsibility
6. Impersonal relations	6. Close colleague relations
7. Service to system	7. Service to client

Fichter has stated that the central difference between these two modes is that the bureaucratic mode emphasizes a procedural orientation ("ways of doing things") while the professional mode stresses a "functional" orientation ("what is accomplished").[59] Both modes place a high value on efficiency in the sense that both try to produce the most work in the best way possible with the available means. The "set way" of doing things, the repetitive procedure has often been said to characterize the bureaucracy. The "better" way of doing things that results from proficient and skillful individuals is characteristic of the professional mode. The bureaucratic mode emphasizes the system of organization and the subordination of the individual to it, whereas the professional mode emphasizes the role of the individual activities and colleague relationships.[60]

---

[56] Roy G. Francis and Robert Stone, Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), p. 156.

[57] Wilensky and Lebeaux, op. cit., p. 308.

[58] Joseph Fichter, Religion as an Occupation (South Bend, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1961), p. 224.

[59] Ibid., p. 227.

In differentiating the various types of role orientations in occupational activity, Wilensky draws a rather clear distinction between "professional service" and "careerist" orientations. Professional service orientation, as he describes it, contains most of the characteristics of the professional mode as described by Fichter in the preceding paragraph. These characteristics include a strong identification with the profession; an orientation toward the outside colleague group; the desire to give competent, objective, technical service of which outside colleagues would approve; and an accent on the full use of skills. In contrast to this, the "careerist" or "organization man" role orientation is pictured in terms of a high identification with the incumbent leadership of the particular organization; an orientation toward a career within the workplace hierarchy; a lack of ideological commitments and dilemma-producing, non-organizational goals; little professional identity; a desire for social mobility and for rewards recognized in the local community--money, promotions, security.[61]

---

[60] Francis and Stone, op. cit., p. 156.

Wilensky put his distinction between these role-orientations to the test by studying a group of lawyers, engineers and professors. His subjects were scored on the basis of their responses to a series of questions focused upon (a) "Whose judgment should count?" (b) "Things Most Important in a Job"; and (c) "Thoroughness in Reading Professional Journals." The validity of his distinction between the two role-orientations seemed to be supported by his data.[62]

In the concrete, everyday operations of organizations, however, one would probably not find either of these modes or orientations in its pure form. There is conflict between the two modes, but any concrete organization may contain both of the opposing principles in varying degrees and varying combinations. This conclusion is borne out in a number of organizational studies, which show that in any large organization there are elements of both bureaucratic and professional orientations which tend to intermesh in some workable fashion. In the large factory system the typical bureaucrats work for management, but they function at the level between top management and the productive workers, and many are specialists with a professional orientation.[63] That there is a sort of inherent strain existing between the two modes is brought out clearly in an account of an Army Dental Officer, as related by Wardwell.[64] He states that this officer, who was in charge of a clinic, would not permit the dentists subordinate to him to fill or extract teeth until he himself had personally checked the teeth in question and approved the recommended course of action.

---

[61] Harold Wilensky, "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXX, No. 2, (September, 1964), p. 151.

[62] Ibid., p. 153. [63] Fichter, op. cit., p. 230.

[64] Walter Wardwell, "Social Integration, Bureaucratization and the Professions," Social Forces, Vol. XXXIII, No. 4, (May, 1955), pp. 356 ff.

It has been said that the modern hospital is perhaps a classic example of the combination of bureaucratic and professional principles. The nurses, representing one of the major employee groups in the hospital, maintain elements of three distinct conceptions of nursing: (1) identity as a hospital employee (bureaucrat); (2) a responsible independent professional; and (3) a public servant (in the religious or humanitarian sense).[65] Each identity provided a different source of loyalty--to the administration, to professional principles and to the patient, respectively. Corwin found that professional standards were more evident among the "degree" nurses than among the "diploma" nurses, and that after graduation, the degree nurses continued to maintain high professional standards. An interesting finding is the fact that after the degree nurses had found employment, their allegiance to the bureaucratic principles greatly increased, with no diminishing of their professional principles.[66]

According to Goode, the professional who is also a bureaucrat is less directly dependent on the professional community for his career development, so that the ordinary sanctions of that community have less impact. Yet, the bureaucracy generally hires, fires or advances him upon the advice of his professional colleagues or superiors. "The bureaucracy thus makes and enforces rules for the professional and becomes, like the professional community, a responsible control agent for the larger society. The professional community is responsible to the bureaucracy for staffing."[67]

---

[65] Ronald Corwin, "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVI, No. 6, (May, 1961), pp. 604-15.

[66] Ibid.

If it be true, as Mills and many others have asserted, that bureaucratization is coming to pervade the professions in American society to an increasing degree, this fact would have some rather important ramifications for the study of Protestant clergymen. Certainly the bureaucratic form of organization in religion has potent influences on the content of theology, the character of the professional clergy and the authority it exercises over its membership. In addition, it might be expected that the recruitment, the training and the standards of success in the ministry would tend to become increasingly similar to comparable processes found in other professions undergoing bureaucratization. The interaction of the two modes of organization as they apply to the Protestant clergyman will now be explored in greater detail.

The Protestant Clergyman as Professional and Bureaucrat

The clergy has been a solidly established profession since the Middle Ages, along with law, medicine and university teaching. Although the clergyman's role has always carried a relatively high level of social prestige, it has not escaped the cutting barbs of dramatists, novelists and other literary commentators. Some of these criticisms are instructive, since they demonstrate awareness--though certainly not of a scientific sort--of the almost inevitable difficulties experienced by the clergyman in being simultaneously a professional, a bureaucrat and a prophet. Bernard Shaw, for example, conceived of any profession as "a conspiracy against the laity." As for the clergy, he wrote:

---

[67] W. J. Goode, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

> It always seems strained to speak of the religious convictions of a clergyman, because nine out of ten clergymen have no religious convictions. They are ordinary officials carrying out a routine of baptizing, marrying and churching; praying, reciting and preaching; and like solicitors or doctors, getting away from their duties with relief to hunt, garden, keep bees, to go into society and the like.[68]

And in an even more caustic vein is Mencken's remark: "A Bishop is a Christian who has achieved a higher ecclesiastical status than Jesus Christ."[69]

One of the first sociological attempts to describe the multifaceted role of the contemporary Protestant clergyman was made by Samuel Blizzard. He suggested that the Protestant clergyman faces "a basic dilemma."[70] The dilemma occurs as a result of the inevitable conflict in role priority in the parish ministry. The theology and seminary training of the clergyman order these roles in one ranking of priority. But the clergyman almost always ends up spending most of his time doing things he considers least important. There seems to be, then, a normative order of priority, but also a functional order which is very much different, resulting in at least some degree of ambivalence. As to the role the clergyman plays, Blizzard states that "some of the practitioner roles of the parish ministry may be classified as traditional, others as neotraditional, still others may be called contemporary."[71] The roles which have been traditionally performed would include the roles of preacher, priest and teacher. There are Biblical definitions for each of these roles, and church tradition also supplies some patterns for their enactment. Role definition, expectations and ideology are, therefore, not lacking, so that the clergyman can "legitimate" the way he performs in these roles. A neotraditional role is that of pastor. This also has a Biblical definition and an ideological definition. Contemporary roles would be "administrator" or "organizer." Since these roles are much more recent in church tradition, there is no clearly defined ideology which would establish "legitimate" behavior in those roles.

---

[68] Goerge Bernard Shaw, The Doctor's Dilemma (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965, original copyright, 1913), p. 47.

[69] H. L. Mencken as quoted in Walter Waggoner, Bachelor of Divinity (New York: Association Press, 1963), p. 43.

[70] Samuel Blizzard, "The Minister's Dilemma,"in Robert Johnson,(ed.), The Changing Church and the Changing Ministry (Philadelphia, 1961), p. 74.

The Catholic priest, the Jewish rabbi and the Protestant minister function in very similar ways in the religious life of American society. Their traditional activities are extended into the same basic areas, and the same skills are needed by all of them. The virtual interchangeability of activities and skills of clergymen is illustrated by the fact that Jewish commentators write about the "Protestantism of rabbinic functions."[72] The phrase refers to the fact that the orthodox rabbi who saw himself as the "scholar-saint" no longer operates very successfully in American society. From being the authority on Talmudic scholarship and on the history and practices of Judaism, the rabbi has become, like the Protestant clergyman, the leader of public worship, the director of educational and social affairs and general promoter and public relations man in charge of the various activities of his congregation and in competition with other synagogues. He is the pastoral counselor in various personal or family crises. He no longer restricts his speaking to the problems of clarifying Jewish tradition, but also preaches on social issues, the latest movie or the most recent theories of child-rearing. He may elect to involve himself in crusades for civil rights or for better international relations. In order to perform all these functions satisfactorily, he takes pride in his "ability to be a friendly person who is able to relate easily to others."[73] These newer activities do not replace the older; Jews expect their rabbis to remain the scholarly authorities on Judaism.

---

[71] Ibid., p. 75.

[72] J. E. Carlin and Saul Mendlowitz, "The American Rabbi: A Religious Specialist Responds to the Loss of Authority," in Marshall Sklare (ed.), The Jews (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958), pp. 377-414.

The Roman Catholic priest is viewed primarily as the mediator between God and man, a sort of channel through which supernatural grace flows to the laity. And he is also the confessor, the shepherd, the moral and spiritual guide. But the American priest is asked to do more. His parish demands a "simultaneous coordination of multiple roles."[74] Fichter refers to the "communal role," which implies that the priest is expected to participate in many kinds of social relationships with his parishioners, both formal and informal. Like his Protestant and Jewish counterparts, the priest must also be the administrator and organizer of a wide variety of lay activities; he must spend a good deal of time trying to raise funds; he must organize and direct recreational activity for the youth of his parish; he must serve as the symbol of and spokesman for Roman Catholicism in his community; and he must act as manager of the welfare activities of the church, dispensing food and other essentials to the needy. Fichter writes that "the priest must conform to the needs of the parish rather than insist upon doing only that for which he is best trained or in which he has the greatest talent and interest. It is a striking anomaly in an age of specialization that the parish priest is forced to maintain an adaptive readiness to be 'all things to all men.'"[75]

---

[73] James Gustafson, "The Clergy in the United States," Daedalus, Vol. XCII, No. 4, (Fall, 1963), p. 726.

[74] Ibid.

Within Protestantism there is a proliferation of activities occurring in two ways: there are new, specialized ministries which require a particular kind of training and skill, and the local parish pastor is finding that the expectations relating to his occupational role are constantly being changed or added to. The many forms of "chaplaincy" which have recently developed in all of the major religious groups would illustrate one type of major development in the profession. Also, in the larger urban congregations, staff ministries are coming into existence. In one congregation, for instance, there might be a minister of music, a youth minister, counseling minister and a minister of administration. One Methodist congregation in Florida even boasted a "minister of world peace."[76]

The local congregation with a single minister persists, however, as the most prevalent form of ministerial office. The Protestant minister, at least as much as his Catholic or Jewish colleagues, feels the pressure of simultaneously fulfilling multiple roles. Blizzard's study of 690

---

[75] Joseph Fichter, Social Relations in an Urban Parish (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 137.

[76] Gustafson, *op. cit.*, p. 727.

Protestant clergymen of various denominations points up the role conflicts felt by most of the clergymen. They were asked to evaluate six roles from three perspectives: importance, effectiveness and enjoyment. It was assumed that in rating the importance of each role, the clergyman was in effect stating the norms for the minister's professional behavior held by the church. The normative view of these six roles, from most to least important, was as follows: preacher, pastor, priest, teacher, organizer, administrator. No differences were observed between urban and rural ministers. In the second stage of this analysis, the clergy were asked to describe their sense of effectiveness in performing the various roles of the ministry. The object was to determine the minister's level of self-involvement in respect to each role. Each man's sense of effectiveness in each role was perceived as an indicator of his motivation or his aspiration as a clergyman. The order of effectiveness in these roles went as follows: preacher, pastor, teacher, priest, administrator, organizer. The third part of the study had to do with feelings of enjoyment associated with each role. The most enjoyable role was that of pastor, with the preacher role a close second. Moderate enjoyment was associated with the roles of teacher and priest, while the roles of administrator and organizer were least enjoyed. Again, there was no significant difference between urban and rural ministers.[77] In another study, Blizzard attempted to discover how the minister allocates his time, assuming that this would reveal how the normative and the motivational are actually expressed at the operational level. Analyzing the professional workdays of 480 rural and urban ministers, Blizzard found that almost 40 per cent of the typical minister's workday was spent in administrative duties. About 25 per cent of the day was spent on pastoral duties. The remainder of the day was split about equally among the priestly, preaching, organizing and teaching duties. No differences were found between urban and rural ministers. It is clear from Blizzard's research that the "operational" order of role priority is quite different from both the normative and the motivational orientations.[78]

---

[77] Samuel Blizzard, op. cit., p. 76.

Max Weber's classification of authority into three general types can be readily applied to the clergyman's role in American churches. Traditional authority, of course, is based upon the argument of long existence. Innovations cannot be admitted. Charismatic authority, on the other hand, is based on the "spiritual gift" and the exceptional powers which the followers attribute to their leader. Following the death of the leader, this type of authority tends to develop into either traditional or legal-rational authority. Bureaucratic leadership is based on legal-rational authority, in which case the leader-follower relationship is basically impersonal. Traditional leadership tends to prevail in the more centralized denominations which place stress on the sanctity of sacramentalism or liturgical worship, or upon an apostolic succession through which the church leaders are traced back to the early apostles. Charismatic leadership in religion is typically found in newly developing cults and sects. Father Divine's "Peace Mission" revolved around the imagined divinity of the founder. Scores of other evangelists, radio ministers and faith healers claim large followings and often organize churches based on the charismatic powers which their disciples ascribe to them.

---

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

"The typical minister," according to Moberg,"is a bureaucratic leader."[79] He finds his role quite clearly defined either by a denominational handbook or a church constitution. Accompanying this bureaucratic orientation are specialization and professionalism. The services subsumed under his calling have been increasingly limited in a sense by specialization and the growth of competing secular professions.[80] The process by which this typical minister has arrived at his current status as professional-bureaucrat can be accounted for, at least to some extent, by exploring the concept of "charisma" and its historic fate in more detail.

The history of world religions provides ample verification of the fact that the magnetic personal powers of the charismatic religious leader are believed to be derived directly from Deity, from whom he receives his original "Call." According to one historian it has been quite characteristic of "evangelical" Protestantism to single out a special call as fundamental. "This call has been conceived as a summons from God made known to the individual through an identifiable and distinctive personal experience."[81] An authentic call, which is usually interpreted as a personal experience or series of experiences, is still regarded by many denominations as a prerequisite for entrance into the ministry. In some groups this inner call may be all that is necessary. In other groups, the inner call may be "tested" or "supplemented" by a period of supervision under a bishop or some official ecclesiastical body. In these groups, the summons by a congregation or some official of the church is usually considered to be as important as the inner calling experience. Practically all Christian denominations of every historical period have made some provision in their formal structure for both "institutional" and "extra-institutional" callings. They have, in other words, accepted as their leaders not only the socially appointed, institutionally recognized priests and apostles, but also have made varying degrees of provision for the "charismatic" leaders--prophetic leaders without human appointment, Even the most hierarchical, bureaucratized churches which insist on the importance of "legitimate" orders do recognize, with the Church of England, that there "always remains the power of God to give to the church prophets, evangelists and teachers apart from the succession."[82]

---

[79] David O. Moberg, The Church as a Social Institution (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962), p. 96.

[80] Ibid.

[81] H. Richard Niebuhr and D. D. Williams (eds.), The Ministry in Historical Perspective (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), p. 271.

In a study of the chief reasons for entering the ministry, Felton found that 38 per cent of some 1700 students from 57 Protestant seminaries gave as their chief reason "a definite call from God." All of the students in the study agreed that this was one of the reasons but there was wide disagreement concerning the definition of a call and the way in which it is received. For many of them it was a gradual process which combined personality characteristics, unique situational factors, aptitudes and attitudes of compassion or devotion.[83]

---

[82] H. Richard Niebuhr, The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry (New York: Harper, 1956), p. 64.

In a survey of rural churches in Missouri, 62 per cent of the "church" type as compared to 85 per cent of the "sect" type clergymen considered themselves to be recipients of a divine call to preach. The greater the stress on fundamentalist beliefs, such as personal conversion experience, the greater the value and stress which were ascribed to the "call" experience.[84] Everett Hughes noted that those denominations which stress the call experience often provide clergymen to those denominations which lack such an emphasis. "The Unitarian denomination furnishes practically no ministers, but must recruit its prophets from emancipated ones of more orthodox denominations."[85]

Strunk analyzed the reasons given by Protestant theological students for their entering the ministry. The sample consisted of 76 first-year students (62 male and 14 female) most of whom were Methodists, though the author did not reveal the statistics concerning denominational affiliation of the sample. In the study, autobiographies were analyzed for the presence of any of the 12 motivational categories established by the author. These categories were described in this way: 1. "A minister is respected, has prestige, is a leader." (Indicates prestige); 2. "I was called by God." (Indicates call); 3. "My parents urged me to become a minister." (Indicates parental influence); 4. "I wanted to serve the needs of other people and help them in their troubles." (Indicates altruism); 5. "I was interested in the things ministers do." (Indicates interest); 6. "I wished to express my natural aptitude for the ministry." (Indicates aptitude); 7. "I wanted to learn about and understand religious matters." (Indicates curiosity); 8. "The ministry is a reasonably secure profession." (Indicates security); 9. "A successful minister usually has a steady financial income." (Indicates monetary gain); 10. "I wanted to make the world a better place to live." (Indicates reform): 11. "A minister's job is glamorous." (Indicates glamor); and 12. "I was anxious and fearful and believed the ministry would help solve my emotional problems." (Indicates emotional inadequacy). The students were asked to rank the above statements in the order of importance. They were also asked to rank their present motives. The findings show that almost 82 per cent of the students named "altruism" as either a first, second or third choice; about 66 per cent indicated "call" as one of their first three choices. There was very high agreement among students in their ranking of motives (at the.001 level of probability). The rank order of motivations for the sample went as follows:[86]

---

[83] Ralph Felton, New Ministers (Madison, N. J.: Drew Theological Seminary, 1949), pp. 15-17.

[84] L. M. Hepple, The Church in Rural Missouri, Part III, Clergymen in Rural Missouri (Columbia, Mo.: A.E.S. Research Bulletin 633C, Dec., 1958), pp. 182-84.

[85] Everett Hughes, Men and Their Work (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958), pp. 29-30.

	Entering motives	Present motives
Altruism	1	1
Call	2	2
Reform	3	3
Interest	4	5
Curiosity	5	4
Aptitude	6	6
Prestige	7	7
Security	8	8
Emotional Inadequacy	9	11
Parental Influence	10	10
Monetary Gain	11	9
Glamor	12	12

---

[86] Orlo Strunk, Jr., "Theological Students: A Study in Perceived Motives," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XXXVI, No. 5, (January, 1958), p. 320.

The study shows the persistence of the "traditional" reasons for entering the ministry, with the top three reasons selected by the students all being of the "traditional" type. The charismatic self-conception, indicated by the response of being "called" by God, proved to be a very popular response among these seminarians.

According to a popular aphorism, "First comes the doxology; then comes the theology; then comes the sociology." Following an original religious experience, there is perceived to be a need to formulate a systematic body of teachings, a codification of doctrine. Following this is the need to preserve and perpetuate the original experience through the organization of a community. After the charismatic leader has passed on there arise attempts to preserve the benefits of charisma, resulting in the process known as the "routinization" of charisma. In this process it is quite conceivable that the instrumental purposes of the organization become elevated to "ends" rather than serving as means. Or as Weber put it: "In institutional charisma the typical problem of deterioration is the drift of functionaries and their education toward specialized performance at the expense of personal inspiration. . . ."[87] Charisma has been defined by Shils as "an intense and immediate contact with what the actors involved believe to be ultimate values or events," as opposed to the "more attenuated, more mediated contact with such values or events through the functioning of established institutions."[88] Although the term "charisma" has traditionally been couched in religious or mystical terms,

---

[87] Reinhard Bendix, Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait (New York: Doubleday, 1960), p. 314.

[88] Edward Shils, "Charisma, Order and Status," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXX, No. 2, (April, 1965), p. 200.

Weber argued that the term could be applied to any kind of personality which transcends the rational-legal definition of roles. But whether the concept is assigned religious meaning or not, charismatic authority could hardly be expected to flourish in either the professional or the bureaucratic mode of organization. A pertinent illustrative case in point is provided by Lee, who quoted a statement attributed to a church extension secretary of a "leading denomination." According to Lee, the churchman remarked that in looking for men to staff the new "high-potential" suburban churches, his committee was:

> . . . considering only the "good" organization man--middle-aged men who have a large barrel of sermons to draw from and who won't have to spend too much time in their studies, men who can build up a church so that it will be on a self-supporting basis before long, men who can begin from scratch and have at least two hundred members within the first two years.[89]

Religiosity and the Socialization of Clergymen

Somewhat related to charisma, conceptually, is the concept of "religiosity." This term has been applied to a whole configuration of behavioral patterns, including such factors as church membership, church attendance, the acceptance of certain religious beliefs, and the extent of "devotional" behavior, among other things. The difficulties in this kind of conceptualization were stated by Feifel:

> Individuals may frequently express a religious identification without formal membership or commitment. Often there may be a difference between the value commitments of the individual and those required by the official theological structure of his faith. Then there are those who incorporate their religious beliefs into . . . everyday living.[90]

---

[89] Robert Lee, "The Organizational Dilemma of American Protestantism," in Robert Johnson (ed.), The Changing Church and the Changing Ministry (Philadelphia: United Presbyterian Church, 1961), p. 91.

[90] Herman Feifel, in H. Feifel (ed.), The Meaning of Death (New York: McGraw Hill, 1959), p. 121.

In attempting to come to grips with the concept of religiosity, Lenski observes that in the religious tradition of the West, various types of religious orientations have competed with each other, each focusing on a different facet of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Among these orientations he lists mysticism, devotionalism, asceticism, ceremonialism, doctrinal orthodoxy, milennialism and ethicalism. For his purposes, Lenski limited his analysis to only two of these--namely, doctrinal orthodoxy and devotionalism. By doctrinal orthodoxy he refers to that orientation which "stresses intellectual consent to prescribed doctrines."[91] The orthodox are thus the persons who profess acceptance of the prescribed beliefs of the church. By devotionalism Lenski means the "orientation that emphasizes the importance of private or personal communion with God." He chooses this term rather than "pietism" because of the evaluative overtones of the latter term.[92] Lenski sees devotionalism as "the more active, behavioral type of orientation of the two," and doctrinal orthodoxy as a "relatively passive intellectual orientation."[93] These particular orientations were selected for study because (a) both seemed, on *a priori* grounds to be mutually exclusive--a highly dubious assumption; and (b) both seemed to be widely accepted by modern Americans. He assumed that the two orientations are separate and independent, each having its own unique consequences for individual behavior.[94] While Lenski's procedure does represent some improvement over the treatment of religiosity by other researchers, it seems highly doubtful to this writer that his two dimensions of religiosity are in fact independent of each other, or that they represent "polarities" on some sort of continuum. It seems quite plausible, in fact, that those who score high in "devotionalism" would also score high in "doctrinal orthodoxy."

---

[91] Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor* (New York: Anchor Books, 1963), p. 25.

[92] *Ibid*. [93] *Ibid*. [94] *Ibid*., p. 26.

Another scheme was suggested by Allport, who recognized the need to distinguish between two basic types of religiosity. The first type is seen as "strictly utilitarian, self-serving, conferring status, comfort and talismanic favors upon the believer. People who are religious in this sense make use of God. In theological terms they turn to God without turning away from self. Their 'faithing' shows them to be dependent and basically infantile."[95] The second type of religiosity is described as one in which religion is not simply utilitarian, but instead is an "intrinsic value, larger than self, wholly beyond self. . . ."[96] Allport suggests that these two types are polar opposites. Although such a distinction may well be sound, theoretically, no instrument has yet been devised which can measure one's religiosity in either of these respects. Moreover, the use of such a scheme would almost necessarily involve interpretations by a psychologist or psychoanalyst, since motivation on the subconscious levels seems clearly implied in the scheme.

For general sociological purposes, and especially for purposes of the present study, a somewhat more manageable approach must be taken to the concept of religiosity. Religiosity undoubtedly possesses more than one dimension--very likely it is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. For purposes of the present study, however, it seems most feasible to classify religiosity into two broad types. These two types, the writer feels, are more likely to represent polar extremes than is Lenski's dichotomy of devotionalism-doctrinal orthodoxy. Utilizing Allport's terminology of "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" religiosity, but attaching somewhat different meanings to those terms, the following general distinctions are suggested:

---

[95] Gordon Allport, _Religion in the Developing Personality_ (New York: New York University Press, 1960), p. 33.

[96] _Ibid_.

Intrinsic Religiosity: A religious orientation which stresses the importance of private or personal communion with God; the daily "devotional" life of prayer, devotional reading and study, and in general, the superiority and pre-eminence of the "inner spiritual life" over organizational duties relating to the institutional church.

Extrinsic Religiosity: A religious orientation which stresses the importance of affiliation with, and participation in, the formally organized church, to the extent that one defines his relationship to God in terms of status with respect to an organized religious body. It de-emphasizes the role of the "inner spiritual life" as being irrelevant to the chief goal of contributing to the ongoing functioning of the church as an organization.

If the professional socialization process tends to stress things like mastery of techniques rather than humanitarian, altruistic, idealistic goals; and if bureaucratization is pervading all types of organizations, not excluding the religious, bringing with it an emphasis on efficiency, external standards of evaluation, and manifest loyalty to the organization, it would seem reasonable to expect what at first glance might seem quite implausible--that is, that as a seminary student proceeds through his formal professional training he might become, in one sense, less religious. His "intrinsic" religiosity might well be expected to diminish, though his "extrinsic" religiosity might be expected, conversely, to increase. Seminaries which seem to emphasize the mastery of technical communications skills might be expected to show a high degree of bureaucratic and professionalistic emphasis in other respects as well, thus creating a distinctly unfavorable climate for such things as charismatic, humanitarian and intrinsic religiosity orientations.

The seminarian, in other words, ought not be casually passed off as a devoutly "religious" person, nor should the seminary be regarded as a purely "religious" institution devoid of the influences of bureaucratic and professionalistic principles. The seminarian must be seen as an apprentice being trained to assume a place within a professional community and, in most cases, probably, within a bureaucratic structure as well. The professional, as pictured by a number of sociological studies, is characterized in terms of the role requirements which he enacts. First, the function he performs cannot be routinized; second, the task requires technical competence and specialized knowledge, so that the professional is the "man who knows;" third, the professional serves people who need him on a personal basis; and fourth, the function the professional performs is highly valued in the culture.[97] The relatively high prestige which professionals enjoy is probably due, largely, to the belief that their services touch upon highly important points in the lives of the general public. The public, perhaps out of necessity, attributes comparatively altruistic and ideational motives to the professional, at least while he acts in the line of duty, and tends to regard him in terms of what he does for them. The public probably does not conceive of the professional as one who is "having fun" as specialist, in the sense that he is oriented toward the enjoyment of his occupation qua occupation.

---

[97] Robert Stone,"The Sociology of Bureaucracy and the Professions," in Joseph Roucek(ed.), Contemporary Sociology (New York: Philosophical Library, 1958), p. 494.

The student who enters into professional training, therefore, could logically be expected to initially possess a large measure of the public's attitude toward the profession which he has selected. He will probably begin his professional training with a fairly high degree of "humanitarian" or "reformist" motivation, expecting that when his training is completed he will be instrumental in making the world a much better place in which to live. During the course of his training, however, he encounters elements of "professional culture" which he had not fully anticipated. Technical competence is stressed, as is the importance of colleague relationships. As the change in his reference groups proceeds from "public" to "profession," he is likely to become oriented to job techniques rather than to that which the job accomplishes, or is expected to accomplish, in society. For, assuming the validity of self theory, a change in reference group and significant others will lead to a change in the manner in which he evaluates himself. The trainee finds himself getting compared, ranked and rated, in terms of both the standards of the profession and the performance of his colleagues. Internalizing the ideology of the profession, he comes to feel that activities in which he is engaged are of infinite worth. If, as in the case of the seminarian, he is also being prepared to assume a position in a bureaucracy, additional emphasis will be placed on organizational imperatives. At the conclusion of his training, then, the fledgling professional has undergone a basic change--from valuing the "ends" of his profession, as defined by the general public, to valuing the "means," at least relatively so. The means tend to become defined, both by the profession and the bureaucracy, as ends in themselves, and take the form of (1) mastery of techniques and (2) loyalty to the organization.

It was shown in The Student Physician that medical schools admit students who are already partially socialized in the norms of the profession. Out of a sample of 498 medical students, 50 per cent had some relative who was also a doctor, and 17 per cent had a doctor as a parent. The researchers also discovered that medical students showed little change in their basic normative orientation during their training, whereas it might be expected that they would have undergone considerable socialization in this respect.[98] The factor of selection could conceivably produce the same sort of result with respect to seminary students. Simon stressed the point that the more effective the socialization, the less the need for control.[99] But Etzioni suggested that socialization and selection can partially substitute for each other--that is, "the same level of control can be maintained by high selectivity and a low level of organizational socialization as with a low selectivity and a high level of organizational socialization. Of course, the amount of control needed is lower where selectivity and socialization are both high."[100] The more pervasive the organization is, in terms of the norms it sets and tries to enforce, the greater is the effort to maintain control. A highly pervasive organization such as the church tends to exert "extra-organizational" normative control as well as setting norms governing behavior within the organization. The extent of selection and socialization within the seminary has never really been empirically assessed. It would be reasonable to expect, however, that sons of clergymen, having received their childhood and adolescent socialization in the family of a father who has been professionally socialized, will be more likely to possess the "desirable" values (from the organizational viewpoint) at the outset of seminary training than would other seminarians. Therefore the seminarians who are sons of ministers, as with medical students who were sons of doctors, would be expected to display a somewhat less marked shift in orientations during professional training than would be true of other students.

---

[98] Robert Merton, G. Reader and Patricia Kendall, The Student Physician (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).

[99] H. A. Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York; Free Press), 1957.

[100] Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 70.

The Nature of Theological Education

The theological schools which prepare men for the ministry reflect essentially the same kinds of difficulties and stresses which characterize the American church as an institution. On the one hand, they have had to faithfully transmit religious traditions, with their sacred writings and many centuries of interpretive commentary on them. But on the other hand, the seminaries have had to train persons for leadership not only for present responsibilities, but also for the future years of the institutional church. Within Protestantism, there are, of course, great variations in the degree to which tradition as opposed to modernism has prevailed in the preparation of clergymen. According to Gustafson, the Methodist and Congregational schools have been more concerned with "relevance" than have the Presbyterians, the Episcopalians and, particularly, the Lutherans.[101]

---

[101] Gustafson, *op. cit.*, p. 739.

The rocky road which theological schools have had to travel in trying to gain acceptance within their own denominations is well documented. As far back as 1870, for example, there was good evidence of the mistrust of seminaries. A minority report in the Methodist Conference of 1870 asserted: "The history of theological schools has little that is favorable to Methodism, and much that is adverse. They have been fruitful sources of heresies innumerable, of a manner of preaching not generally desirable and rarely effectual among us, and of that formalism that never favors experiential religion."[102] In 1872 the Southern Methodist Church, in a controversy over the establishment of a university by that church, drew this comment from one of its Bishops: "It is my opinion that every dollar invested in a theological school will be a damage to Methodism. Had I a million, I would not give a dime for such project."[103] And to cite one final example of the strength of the sentiment expressed against theological schools, a quotation from Archdeacon Mackay-Smith's article in an 1889 issue of *Harper's* magazine is pertinent. "A man mangled by a seminary," he wrote, "is worse than one with no preparation. Just as weeds in a neglected garden are ranker than those in the wilderness."[104] These statements are not to be interpreted, of course, as expressions of popular sentiment in the contemporary Methodist Church. There has been, however, in some branches of Protestantism, a long-standing suspicion of education in general, "which has ranged from deliberate cultivation of an attitude of ignorance and obscurantism that revelled in 'the old time religion' to a mistrust of certain 'modern' universities and seminaries."[105]

---

[102] Robert Michaelson, "The Protestant Ministry in America: 1850 to the Present," in H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 275. [104] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

Among the more "modern" of these seminaries are such major university schools as Yale, Harvard, Chicago and Union in New York. These seminaries have been, broadly speaking, the avant garde in Protestant theology, particularly during the past half-century.[106] Although they were originally denominational in character, most of these seminaries are now essentially "independent" or inter-denominational. They have exerted a potent influence on the denominational seminaries in moving the latter toward a greater adjustment to intellectual trends. In addition, they have offered graduate training for many of the graduates of denominational seminaries, and have provided a growing proportion of teachers for the denominational schools. These independent university-related seminaries have also prepared many college teachers, ecumenical leaders and specialized types of ministers in areas which deviate from the traditional patterns of theological education.[107]

In an analysis of theological education in the U. S. which was published in 1924, Kelly surveyed seminary curricula dating back to 1872. He found that the seminary curricula in that year emphasized exegetical theology and the study of the original Biblical languages. By 1895 the emphasis had shifted toward historical and practical theology. New types of courses were being introduced such as "missions," ethics, elocution or "sacred oratory" and even sociology. By 1921, the curricula provided for more specialization and an even more practical emphasis, including a growing number of courses in "practical theology," sociology of religion, religious education, psychology of religion, and rural and urban church. Kelly concluded that "the program of study was changing from the dogmatic to the practical."[108]

---

[105] Ibid. [106] Ibid., p. 273. [107] Ibid.

Throughout the 1920's the impact of "liberal" theology was felt, as was the movement for social action and a more progressive Christian education in the parishes. The consequence was a continuing stress on the vocational and practical courses. In subsequent decades, however, there has been a sort of re-emphasis on Biblical scholarship and languages. But the non-theological additions to the curriculum, particularly in the fields of sociology and psychology, are also persisting in popularity.

Theological education for the Protestant ministry cannot be said to exist, actually, for some parts of Protestantism. Seminaries, in other words, with their standard entrance requirement of an accredited bachelor's degree, are limited to the more "ecclesiastical" Protestant bodies. Such groups as the Pentecostal, Holiness and "free" sects, the latter consisting of the many offshoot groups which have disaffiliated themselves from their parent denominational bodies, have established what are usually termed "Bible Institutes" for training their clergy. These schools accept "called" laymen as candidates for training, and the usual academic requirement for admission is a high school diploma. For a few of these religious groups, the "calling" alone would be sufficient qualification for the leadership of the group.

---

[108] Ibid.

Organization of Religious Group and Professionalism in Leadership

Among the earliest and most useful schemas for analyzing the characteristics of organized Christian groups was Troeltsch's "church-sect" typology. He pictured the sect as a group interpreting the teachings of Christ in a literal manner, and of being composed of a small, voluntary group of converts who seek to realize the "divine law" in their own behavior. The sect represents a community set apart from and in opposition to the world around it. It stresses the eschatological features of doctrine, maintains ideals of frugality and poverty, discourages participation in political affairs and emphasizes equality of religious believers. No sharp distinction is drawn between clergy and laity, and its appeal tends to be to the lower classes.[109] The church, in contrast to the sect, emphasizes the "forgiving" and redemptive aspects of Christianity, and accepts many of the characteristics of the secular world as good, or at least tolerable. It seeks to dominate all elements within society, and to dispense salvation to them by means of sacraments administered by ecclesiastical office holders. It tends to be conservative, politically, and allied with the upper classes.[110]

The concepts of church and sect as described by Troeltsch and others are probably not in complete correspondence with reality. They are intended as ideal types, and no religious group would be expected to meet all the criteria set up for one type or the other. Many sociologists have been critical of this typology, arguing that very few of America's religious organizations could be validly classed as either churches or sects in these terms, since many of the elements in both groups seem to vary independently.[111] In attempting to reformulate this typology, Benton Johnson has suggested the following definitions:

---

[109] Ernest Troeltsch, _The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches_ (New York: Macmillan, 1932), Vol. I, pp. 328-349.

[110] _Ibid._

> A church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists. A sect is a religious group that rejects the social environment in which it exists. . . . The distinction between church and sect involves a single variable the values of which range along a continuum from complete rejection to complete acceptance of the environment.[112]

Johnson asserts that American religion, in general, supports dominant values and is basically "churchly." The old-line Protestant denominations in America, including the Methodists, Presbyterians and Episcopalians, are placed very close to the "church" end of the continuum, with groups such as the Lutherans, Baptists and Disciples of Christ occupying positions slightly more toward center. At the sect end of the continuum are the various Pentecostal, Holiness and other fundamentalist groups.[113]

Elaborating somewhat on the differences between these two ideal types, Demerath remarks that the extremes (i.e., church and sect) differ along two major axes: first, their internal characteristics and secondly, their relation to the external world at large. Internally, the church has a professional leadership, a comparatively impersonal fellowship, and rather lax criteria for membership. It stresses the sacraments and ritualism. In contrast, the sect's leadership is charismatic and quite clearly non-professional. Also, the sect has strict membership standards, including a conversion experience and some behavioral evidence of the member's religious claims. Spontaneity and personal testimony are valued much more highly than ritual observances in the sect. Externally, the church fits into the secular order by constant adaptation and compromise, which leads to a general stability of the organization as well as a large following. If traditional doctrine seems to conflict with prevailing social values, it is usually the doctrine which is compromised. As Johnson also noted, the sect, conversely, is either aloof or openly hostile toward the secular society, which it often refers to as the "world." The sect's members have only secondary allegiances to secular groups and their ideologies.[114]

---

[111] Peter L. Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," Social Research, Vol. XXI, (Winter, 1954), p. 474.

[112] Benton Johnson, "In Church and Sect," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, (August, 1963), p. 542.

[113] *Ibid.*, pp. 545, 549.

The concepts of church and sect were related to social class differences by Weber, who commented upon the inferior status of American sects as compared with the "genteel" constituency of the churches.[115] Recent research has supported this correlation between organizational type and social class position. S. D. Clark, Thomas O'Dea, and Liston Pope are only a few of the many researchers who have found churches to carry a higher-status composition than sects.[116] These studies found that sects generally originate as lower class splinter movements of the more established churches. The appeal of a movement promising ultimate salvation and other rewards despite present failures in this world is unmistakably strong to the more deprived members of society.

---

[114] N. J. Demerath III, Social Class in American Protestantism (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 38.

[115] Ibid., p. 39.

[116] S. D. Clark, Church and Sect in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948); Liston Pope, Millhands and Preachers (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1942); and Thomas O'Dea, The Mormons (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

In time, however, the sect finds increasing difficulties in maintaining its stability as an organization. It finds that a fully converted membership is increasingly difficult to maintain. It also discovers that non-professional leaders do not always possess the desired charisma, and an ethic basically at odds with dominant social values has constant difficulty in surviving. Thus the sect, in order to maintain its identity, gradually becomes more and more church-like. The doctrine takes on less militancy, the membership standards become more lenient, the leadership of the group must have some training to accompany the calling. All of these characteristics can be found in history of such groups as the Quakers, the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mormons, and also the more "respectable" Baptists and Methodists.[117]

This change from sect to church is accompanied by a change in status composition. The status level of the sect-becoming-church rises. This might occur in one of two ways. First, there may be a large-scale turnover in membership as described by Pope and Clark among the Southern Baptists and Canadian Methodists. Second, the original members of the sect might experience upward mobility, as may be illustrated by the work of O'Dea, in the case of the Mormons, or Johnson, in the case of the Holiness sects.

In differentiating between sect and denomination, Vernon draws distinctions based on several criteria. One distinction he makes as to the nature of the clergy in the two types of religious organization is as follows: "Sect: Unspecialized; little if any professional training; frequently part-time." The clergy of the denomination is described as "specialized; professionally trained; full time."[118] Moberg observes that "educational demands on the clergy and their status in society are directly related to the socioeconomic level of the denomination's membership."[119] Members of high prestige churches seek clergymen who will enhance the church's general position and membership recruitment ability. As Pope noted, the demands and the facilities for a trained ministry are thus both cause and effect of the class position of a particular denomination.[120]

---

[117] Demerath, op. cit., p. 40.

In an interesting and recent study of the friendships and colleague relationships of ministers across denominational lines, C. Dale Johnson develops a typology of ministers.[121] The "professional" minister is contrasted with the "prophetic" minister, and the distinctions between them seem to reflect strongly the distinctions which have been made between church and sect. The professional minister sees his authority as being based on technical competence in the tasks of the ministry, whereas the prophetic type sees his authority as residing in his personal charismatic authority stemming from a divine call. The training of the professional type is described as critical, with a scholarly emphasis, as opposed to the training of the prophetic type, which is described as being useless without the "call," and superfluous with it. The pastoral work of the professional minister centers upon the techniques of counseling, while that of the prophetic minister stresses conversion of the "unsaved" and the supervision of members regarding their observance of taboos. Theologically, the professional is characteristically ecumenical. He sees his colleague relationships in strongly inter-denominational terms, is tolerant of diversity, and favors interdenominational organizations. The prophetic minister, in contrast, sees colleague relationships in a very different light. He determines his relationships with other clergy on the basis of their charismatic qualifications, disregarding training or technical competence. He is not interested in interdenominational organizations which would include "modernists" or those who would view the ministry as a profession rather than as a calling.[122]

---

[118] Glenn Vernon, Sociology of Religion (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 174.

[119] David Moberg, op. cit., p. 503.

[120] Liston Pope, op. cit., p. 116.

[121] C. Dale Johnson, "When Ministers Meet," Trans-Action, Vol. III, No. 4, (May/June, 1966), p. 32.

The relationship between social class status of the denomination and the degree of professionalism of its clergy has never, to the writer's knowledge, been empirically assessed. Employing the criterion of class status of the membership, some sociologists have arrived at a status ranking of denominations. This prestige ranking, which seems to be quite representative of numerous community studies as well as of large national samples, goes as follows:[123]

---

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[123] Herbert Schneider, *Religion in 20th Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), Appendix, p. 228.

1. Episcopal
2. Congregational
3. Presbyterian
4. Methodist
5. Lutheran
6. Christian (Disciples of Christ)
7. Baptist

This is, of course, a ranking of the principal denominations in American Protestantism. Therefore it should be realized that the majority of the numerically smaller sects and cults generally classed as "Protestant" would carry much lower social prestige than would the Baptists or Disciples of Christ groups, who, in turn, are only relatively lower in class status than the higher ranking denominations.

The close association between this prestige ranking and the position of each denomination on the "church-sect" continuum discussed previously seems quite apparent. The professionalism of the leadership in "churchly" groups, accompanied by increased demands on the educational qualifications of their clergy, has already been discussed. It should seem plausible from what has been said thus far that as a religious organization moves further from the sect category towards the church category, the organization is also becoming increasingly accepted by, and accepting of, the dominant society. It is, concomitantly, in the process of developing greater emphasis on the professional competence of its leadership. If this is true, then one could expect that the degree of professional socialization in the training institutions of the religious group would be in close correspondence to the prestige ranking of that group.

Withdrawals from Seminary Training

The characteristics of students who decide to withdraw from professional training, and the imputed motivations for their decision to withdraw, have been described in a few recent studies. No clear picture of any "drop-out type" emerges from a review of these studies. A study done by Harold Darling is often cited by sociologists of religion as evidence that the "persisting" student in seminary training is more likely to feel "called" than is his colleague who withdraws from training. Also, the "persister" is somewhat more "altruistic," though not significantly more so.[124] What is not usually mentioned is the fact that Darling was concerned with "evangelical" colleges only--those with a formally stated "fundamentalist" orientation. Also, his sample consisted of fifteen four-year colleges, four two-year colleges and four "Bible Colleges" of evangelical persuasion. Thus, one could easily object that his study could hardly be said to be typical of Protestant professional ministerial training. First, he is only concerned with the groups which would properly be categorized as "sects"; and second, even the training schools which were studied could hardly be considered the equivalent of a theological seminary, except by a very rough comparison.

In ascertaining the values of men who voluntarily quit seminary training, Maehr and Stake used as their sample the classes entering a Lutheran (Missouri Synod) seminary in the years 1951, 1952 and 1953. One hundred students who entered and completed the program without delay were selected as "successful" students; seventy-one students from the same classes with the same intentions, originally, as the successful students, but who had voluntarily withdrawn from training, were chosen as "unsuccessful." The authors discovered no significant differences between these two classes of students in respect to either academic ability or religious values. The successful students scored slightly higher on the economic scale (on the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values) and significantly lower on the aesthetic scale. The authors state:

---

[124] Harold W. Darling, "A Comparative Study of Persisting and Non-Persisting Ministerial Candidates in Evangelical Colleges," Ph.D. thesis, Purdue University, 1958; Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XX, (August, 1959), pp. 586-87.

> One might expect the opposite to be the case, that the persisting students would have less interest in the materialistic, and more interest in the aesthetic, but apparently not. One might speculate that the unexpectedly mundane, deliberate life of the seminary did not satisfy the aesthetic needs of the students who dropped out."[125]

There appears to be, then, a somewhat contradictory image of the dropout which emerges from these studies. Darling finds the dropout to be less charismatic than his fellow students, and somewhat less altruistic; Maehr and Stake, on the other hand, find the dropout to be more aesthetically inclined and less oriented toward materialism. Maehr and Stake reported no differences in religious values, although with a finer measuring device which would take into account various types of religiosity, they may well have found some significant differences. What, then, can be said which might possibly reconcile these findings? Perhaps there is one way out of the dilemma.

Recalling the empirical evidence cited earlier in this chapter which indicated that the strongest, most highly ranked motives for entering the ministry were the "calling," altruism and reform, it should follow that in the case of a seminary where these motives were clearly discouraged or frustrated, one could expect a high dropout rate. We are assuming here, of course, that "the" seminary student brings these motives into his first year of training. But this is probably not too safe an assumption, since there are clearly differences in the backgrounds and attitudes of seminary students, and differences in theological beliefs according to denominational affiliation, all of which will be in interaction with the variations in emphasis placed upon "professionalism" by each individual seminary. The crucial factor, therefore, pertaining to dropout rates may lie in the degree of "disparity" between the professionalistic emphasis of the seminary (as determined by the curricular requirements for the degree), on the one hand, and the professionalistic orientation of the students on the other. If this is true, then, we could conclude that the dropout could not be stereotyped *a priori* as non-charismatic or as highly charismatic, or as possessing more or less altruism than his colleagues who continue their education. The dropout is probably the person whose values, attitudes and aspirations are markedly different from those of the other students in that seminary, or who perceives his training in seminary as being alien to his own orientations. Referring back to the study of dropouts from training in "evangelical" colleges, in which the dropout was found to be less altruistic and less often called to the ministry, we could perhaps explain this to some extent by observing that in that type of training institution a person without a clear feeling of being called to the ministry would be in a small minority. The training itself would in all likelihood lack most of the "professionalizing" and "bureaucratizing" elements of professional socialization, since sects are less bureaucratic than denominations and are less likely to desire highly professional clergy. For that type of training school, therefore, we might predict that the dropout rate is likely to be low, since the disparity between the emphasis of the school and the orientations of the students is low. In addition, we would also predict that the dropout from that school would in fact be less charismatic or "called" than the other students--which is, of course, what Darling's research revealed. The school which Maehr and Stake studied, in contrast, was a theological seminary of a major Protestant denomination. The more professionalistic training received in that seminary would lead to the prediction that the dropouts from that seminary would be _more_ charismatic and humanitarian or altruistic than their colleagues who continue. This would, generally speaking, be in keeping with the findings of Maehr and Stake.

---

[125] Martin Maehr and Robert E. Stake, "Value Patterns of Men Who Voluntarily Quit Seminary Training," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. XL, No. 6, (February, 1962), pp. 537 ff.

Statement of Problem

The problem of this particular research paper centers upon the nature of the process by which Protestant seminary students, representing the major denominations in this society, are socialized into the role of professional clergyman. The foregoing discussion of relevant empirical studies and theoretical formulations from various topical areas of sociology has, it is hoped, provided the foundation upon which the hypotheses of this study may rest.

A basic assumption in this study is that seminary students, like medical students or law students, are subject to certain social forces to which all professionals-in-training are subject--forces which stem from the unique demands of the profession as an occupational type. It is also assumed that in the case of the seminarians, perhaps more so than in the case of other professionals, the training process is aimed not simply at producing capable professionals but in training willing and efficient workmen to fill the prescribed positions of a bureaucratic structure as well. The relationship between the professional orientation and the bureaucratic orientation has already been discussed in some detail. This relationship is not to be viewed as one involving irreconcilable conflicts. It is doubtful that the seminarian feels himself impaled on the horns of any dilemma. The reason for this, to some extent at least, is that the two modes of orientation are probably "temporary allies" during the training period, united, in a sense, by their common opposition to certain value orientations of the trainee--orientations which would interfere with the level of professional competence and also with efficient, harmonious functioning as bureaucrat. Following from these various assumptions, the hypotheses of the study can now be stated. The concepts employed in the hypotheses will be formulated and operationalized in Chapter II.

Statement of the Hypotheses

1. The greater the length of the seminarians' professional training:
    - (a) the lesser the degree of "charismatic" orientation;
    - (b) the lesser the degree of "humanitarian-reformist" orientation;
    - (c) the lesser the degree of "intrinsic" religiosity;
    - (d) the greater the degree of "mastery of communications skills" orientation;
    - (e) the greater the degree of "bureaucratic" orientation;
    - (f) the greater the degree of "extrinsic" religiosity.

2. Seminarians who are sons of clergymen, in contrast with all other seminarians at comparable levels of professional training, will exhibit:

   (a) a lesser degree of "charismatic" orientation;

   (b) a lesser degree of "humanitarian-reformist" orientation;

   (c) a lesser degree of "intrinsic" religiosity;

   (d) a greater degree of "mastery of communications skills" orientation;
   (e) a greater degree of "bureaucratic" orientation;

   (f) a greater degree of "extrinsic" religiosity.

3. The greater the professionalistic orientation of the seminary, as reflected by its curriculum, the greater will be the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) exhibited by its seminarians.

4. The "independent" university-related seminaries will show a greater degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) among their students at both the beginning and concluding stages of professional training than will the denominational seminaries which are formally identified with a particular religious denomination.

5. The higher a seminary ranks on any of the six criteria of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above), the higher it will rank on each of the other criteria of professional socialization.

6. The greater the social prestige enjoyed by a denomination, the greater will be the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) of its seminarians.

7. There is no significant relationship between the withdrawal rate of a seminary and the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) exhibited by its seminarians.

8. The greater the "disparity" between the professionalistic emphasis of a seminary's curriculum and the degree of professional socialization exhibited by its seminarians (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above), the higher will be the withdrawal rate for that seminary.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The specific purposes of any research, ideally, can be classified into one of approximately four broad categories or goals: (a) to become more familiar with or to obtain fresh insights into a phenomenon, (b) to accurately describe the traits of any given person, group or situation--with or without any initial hypotheses, (c) to discover how frequently something occurs, or the degree to which it is related to the occurrence of something else--usually, though not always, involving an initial hypothesis, and (d) to test a hypothesis in which a causal relationship between variables is implied or predicted.[1] It is difficult to classify the present study into any one of these general research goals to the exclusion of the other three. For even though a series of specific hypotheses has been formulated in the previous chapter, the study has certain elements of the "exploratory" study--a type of study which typically generates rather than tests hypotheses. One of the purposes of this study is to bring certain sociological tools to bear upon the analysis of the period of training during which Protestant seminarians, representing a variety of major denominations, come to be recognized as professionals. To the writer's knowledge, this has not been done before--at least not any "in-depth" comparative analysis. Another aim of this study is to assist in the clarification of such concepts as "religiosity" and "charisma." This is not to say that the study has succeeded in this respect, but, hopefully, it may serve as a stepping stone to more rigorous and sophisticated efforts in the future.

---

[1] Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Holt, 1959), p. 50.

In addition to its "exploratory" elements, the present study has "descriptive" characteristics, in that it is concerned with describing certain characteristics of groups of seminarians and of their professional training situation. Another aim--again characteristic of descriptive studies--is to determine the frequency of certain "orientations" among certain groups of students, the extent to which the occurrence of any of these orientations in one group is related to the occurrence of any of the other orientations in the same group, and also to compare the groups in terms of the degree to which their members can be characterized as adhering to one orientation or another.

Studies attempting to demonstrate causality between variables, in spite of their oftentimes sophisticated methodology, inevitably encounter some formidable obstacles. The present study does not provide conclusive evidence of causal relationships between variables. On the other hand, it would not be accurate to conclude that it is not concerned with causality, since the stated hypotheses would seem to imply that there may, indeed, be a causal relationship between certain variables--e.g., the chief ones being the level of professional training of the student (in terms of years of training completed) and the degree to which he will demonstrate "professional socialization," a term to be operationally defined shortly. Causality, then, is of some concern here, although the attempt to attain some knowledge of it must be regarded as quite exploratory. In defense of this position, the writer would appeal to the familiar scientific maxim that it is more important, sometimes, to formulate a question than it is to provide an answer.

The Source of Data

This research entails an analysis of data which, originally, was collected for quite a different sort of research problem. There are several inherent limitations imposed upon any secondary analysis, of course, and these will be discussed throughout this report. The writer, however, was convinced that the primary data in this case were suitable for the testing of the study's hypotheses.

The data to be analyzed were drawn from a sample of questionnaire responses to a continent-wide survey of Protestant seminarians. The survey was sponsored by the American Association of Theological Schools and the National Association of Biblical Instructors under a grant from Lilly Endowment, Inc. It was directed by Dr. Keith Bridston, Professor of Systematic Theology, Pacific Lutheran Seminary, Berkeley, California, and by Dr. Dwight W. Culver, Chairman of the Sociology Department, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. Their study was concerned with pre-seminary education, primarily. They sought to provide some empirically firm footing on which seminary educators and administrators could base their answers to questions in regard to the best college preparation for seminary study. The items on the comprehensive twelve-page questionnaire employed in their study range far beyond the area of pre-seminary education. The questions inquire into family background, socioeconomic characteristics, religious background and attitudes of seminarians toward such things as the "proper" role of the clergyman, their current religious beliefs and their expectations relative to becoming a clergyman. The 17,565 questionnaires received by Culver and Bridston represented 83 per cent of those registered in Protestant seminaries in North America during the school year of 1962-63. Their study, therefore, is virtually a census of Protestant seminarians, undoubtedly yielding the most complete description of theological students yet attempted.

Selection of the Sample

The Associate Director of the study, Dr. Culver, agreed to provide the writer with complete data on a sub-sample of approximately 2000 students chosen from the original sample. The selection of the sample was guided by certain prime considerations in order to maximize its usefulness for the purposes of this research. First, it was felt that the sample should contain only those seminarians pursuing a degree program--i.e., the Bachelor of Divinity degree or equivalent. Secondly, the sex factor was controlled by selecting only males. Thirdly, only the major denominations were chosen for study. In a sense, this was inevitable, since the sects of Protestantism do not normally maintain seminaries at all, but rather "Bible Schools," which are not the full equivalent of seminaries. A major denomination was operationally defined as any denomination operating three or more seminaries. Ten denominations met that requirement. Fourth, the writer decided to use only two groups of students within each seminary, namely, those B.D. males enrolled in their first year of study and those enrolled in their third year of study. Since comparisons were to be made between first-year and third-year students in terms of several variables, it was deemed feasible to include entire populations of first-year and third-year students in a restricted number of seminaries. The intention was to strengthen whatever conclusions might be drawn about differences between first-year and third-year students by (in a sense) controlling for the influence of a particular seminary itself. This method was favored over the selection of a purely random sample drawn from the 17,565 persons in the Culver-Bridston survey, since the random sample in the latter case would fail to control for the differing social and intellectual climates prevailing among the various seminaries. It was felt that these factors might well exert significant influences on the professional socialization process. In addition, the random sample would render any analysis of the seminaries themselves rather unrealistic since the number of seminaries represented would be exorbitant, and the number of students within each of those schools would be too few to permit any justifiable conclusions about the seminaries.

The next step was to decide which seminaries were to be selected. Again, in order to strengthen the representativeness of the sample, those seminaries with the highest rate of questionnaire return within each denomination were chosen. It was believed that to select a seminary with a low return rate would not be desirable. Even though whole populations of responding first-year and third-year students are included, those populations may very well be quite unrepresentative of all first-year and third-year students in that seminary. In regard to the number of seminaries selected from each of the ten major denominations in the sample, a rule of thumb was applied, whereby one-third of each denomination's seminaries were eligible for inclusion. From this number, then, the seminaries having the highest return rates were selected. The proportion of one-third was chosen, rather than one-half or one-fourth, simply because by doing so, a sample of approximately two thousand students was realized. As it turned out, this method of selecting the sample yielded a sample of 2347 students.

After selecting the sample of seminaries, the writer conferred with Dr. Culver, who has had extensive background in theological education as well as sociology, in order to determine whether there appeared to be any significant degree of obvious bias in the sample of seminaries thus selected. After thoroughly examining the sample, Culver concluded that the sample did in fact seem to be representative of each denomination's seminaries, in terms of such factors as region of country, age and size of enrollment of seminary and the reputed social or intellectual climate of the seminaries. On the basis of these procedures, twenty-four seminaries were selected. Table 1 indicates the number of seminaries chosen from each denomination along with the percentage of response rate for each.

It is obvious that the rule-of-thumb mentioned previously was not adhered to strictly, although roughly one-third of each denomination's total number of seminaries were chosen. Selecting the independents was done quite arbitrarily, in that the three largest, non-denominational university-affiliated seminaries were selected, regardless of their percentage of response rates--which, incidentally, were lower than any of the mean response rates of the ten denominations represented. Obviously, denominational affiliation or non-affiliation is not always clearly defined. Many of the seminaries in the original sample, for example, may maintain rather loose or informal ties with one or more denominations without possessing any formal organizational affiliation with them. It

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES SELECTED AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE RATES

Denomination	Number of Seminaries (Denomination Total)	Number of Seminaries (Selected)	Percentage of Response Rate (Denomination)	Percentage of Response Rate (Selected Seminaries)
Southern Baptist	6	2	79	96
Methodist	11	3	86	98
United Presbyterian, U. S. A.	7	2	91	98
American Baptist	10	3	72	96
Protestant Episcopal	11	3	82	100
Lutheran Church in America	9	3	85	95
American Lutheran Church	3	1	90	97
Presbyterian, U. S.	3	1	95	99
United Church of Christ	4	1	89	91
Disciples of Christ	5	2	81	99
"Independents"	-	3	-	64

can be said of the three independent seminaries selected that all of them are quite clearly independent of organizational ties, and serve the needs of a wide variety of Protestant denominations.

To preserve confidentiality of the cooperating seminaries, each of the twenty-four seminaries in the sample was assigned a code name, indicating its denominational affiliation only. The code names of the seminaries in each denomination are given below.

Denomination	Code Names of Seminaries in Sample
Southern Baptist	SB-1, SB-2
Methodist	M-1, M-2, M-3
United Presbyterian, U. S. A.	UP-1, UP-2
American Baptist	AB-1, AB-2, AB-3
Protestant Episcopal	E-1, E-2, E-3
Lutheran Church in America	LCA-1, LCA-2, LCA-3
American Lutheran Church	ALC-1
Presbyterian, U. S.	P-1
United Church of Christ	UCC-1
Disciples of Christ	DC-1, DC-2
Independents	I-1, I-2, I-3

Working Definitions of the Major Variables

The major variables of the present analysis, as given in the hypotheses stated in Chapter I, are described as "orientations." The vagueness of this term from an empirical standpoint is obvious. Yet it is its lack of a clear definition which prompted its selection for use in this study, since the nature of the data would render the more familiar sociological terms such as "value" or "attitude" even less satisfactory for purposes of this study. This is because of the fact that this is essentially a "post factum" analysis, employing data never intended to elicit precise conceptual distinctions of that order. Instead, the Culver-Bridston questionnaire yields considerable data which can best be treated, realistically, as "inclinations," "opinions" or "predispositions." Thus the word "orientation" was chosen precisely because of the generality of its meaning.

It was necessary, early in the study, to decide as precisely as possible--within the limits imposed by the data--how each of the major variables was to be rendered testable and measurable. This process seems, inevitably, to introduce the element of arbitrariness, since the researcher tends to bend the meaning of the general concept to suit the immediate purposes of the study. Thus, in the present study, four of the major "orientations" were defined largely in terms of how the clergyman perceives his profession and his role as a professional. The working definitions of these orientations, then, would not be generalizable to studies of other kinds of professionals without considerable reformulation. The following definitions of the major variables in the study were used as a guideline to the selection of indicators.

Charismatic Orientations. The tendency to believe that the ministry is a "divine calling"; that those who enter this profession should of necessity possess a genuine calling from God: that having received this calling is of incomparably greater importance than possessing any configuration of desirable personality or intellectual characteristics: and that the ministry is a unique and exalted form of Christian service. whose practitioners should defend their "spiritual gift" against routinization.

Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation. The tendency to believe that the clergyman, whatever his theological stance. ought to emphasize his role of "minister" by being primarily concerned with serving the needs of mankind. To accomplish this, he must be sensitive to social problems and injustices, and be prepared to assume responsibility for community leadership in realistically dealing with these problems.

Bureaucratic Orientation. The tendency to stress the role of the clergyman in maintaining the organizational stability of his denomination and promoting its general welfare by means of efficiently conducting denominational business, acting at all times as a loyal representative of his denomination, and encouraging the type of interpersonal and interdenominational relationships conducive to the welfare of the denomination.

Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation. The tendency to stress the importance of the clergyman's communicating effectively the teachings of his denomination to the members of his parish, not only through officiating and preaching in the formal worship setting but also in the less formalized counseling situations.

Intrinsic Religiosity. The tendency to stress the importance of the "experiential" aspects of religion, such as conversion, the private or personal "communion" with God as a person, and, generally, the preeminence of the "inner spiritual" life of devotion and prayer over formal involvement in activities of the organized church. The "fundamentalist" theological stance is one which, almost by definition, stresses intrinsic religiosity.

Extrinsic Religiosity. The tendency to stress the importance of affiliation and participation within the organized church, with the belief that such involvement represents the principal criterion by which one's relationship to God is defined. Greater organizational involvement--both within one's denomination and between denominations--is seen as a religiously desirable goal; and, conversely, the "inner spiritual life" of devotion, meditation and prayer is de-emphasized as being essentially irrelevant.

Degree of Professional Socialization. The extent to which the group of seminary students exhibits high levels of "mastery of communications skills orientation," "extrinsic religiosity" and "bureaucratic orientation," combined with low levels of "charismatic orientation," "intrinsic religiosity" and "humanitarian-reformist orientation."

Professionalistic Emphasis in Curriculum. The degree to which the seminary requires, as part of the requirements for the Bachelor of Divinity degree, courses which emphasize the characteristics of "professional socialization," as defined above.

The Selection of Indicators of the Major Variables

As was mentioned previously, the questionnaire employed in the Culver-Bridston study was designed to elicit information not directly related to the purposes of this study. Many of the shortcomings here can be attributed to this single fact. Another difficulty arises from the nature of the major variables employed in this study. Scales of charismatic orientation, for instance, have never been developed. Nor are there measurement techniques available to determine the degree of strength of any of the other orientations. This is partly due to the fact that even though all of the terms used to describe these orientations do in fact exist in sociological usage, these terms are revised in a sort of ad hoc fashion to suit the immediate needs of this particular study. In addition, the use of the very broad label, "orientation," rather than more conventional and more specific terms such as value or attitude, can be interpreted as an implicit admission that the measurement techniques to be used in this study will, of necessity, lack the rigor, precision and general sophistication possessed by some sociological analyses.

The first step taken in the selection of indicators of the six major variables was a thorough examination of the items employed in the Culver-Bridston questionnaire. This process yielded a list of potential indicators for each of the variables, ranging from approximately eight to twelve such items per variable. These items were picked on the basis of face validity--that is, their apparent agreement with the definitions of the variables as given earlier in this chapter. "Face" or "logical" validity, obviously, contains a number of serious pitfalls for any researcher who places undue confidence in it. In order to provide a stronger empirical basis for the establishment of validity in this study, a rather unorthodox method was employed. The rationale for this method rests upon the assumption that if a set of indicators possesses validity, it also possesses reliability. The existence of reliability, even though it would certainly not be sufficient to establish validity, can nevertheless be said to be a necessary "ingredient" of validity. Therefore an attempt was made to strengthen the claims to validity of indicators by establishing the reliability--more specifically, the internal consistency --of the indicators. This method begins by assuming that there are substantial differences in the correlation of items with one another. The problem therefore is to select from the possible available items those which correlate most highly with each other, thus increasing the reliability of the measurement instrument as a whole by increasing its internal consistency.[2] This method is concerned primarily with the "equivalence" of two or more items, reducing unreliability resulting from the lack of equivalence of items. The most typical index of equivalence is a correlation coefficient. In this connection Festinger and Katz comment: "The existence of correlation between pairs of items is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of the existence of unity between all the items that make up a test."[3] Thus the decision was made to select only those indicators which correlate highly with each other, the underlying logic being that if a seminary ranks high on one item which supposedly indicates the existence of some orientation, it ought to rank comparably high on all other items which purportedly indicate the same variable. Such would be the case, at least, if the items do in fact possess validity.

The means by which the various "potential indicators" were correlated with each other was based on the ranking of the twenty-four seminaries according to the degree to which the students in these schools responded to the item in question. The rank order method was chosen since it seemed to be the most feasible means of accomplishing the purpose. For whenever no ready measure of a variable is at hand, as McCormick and Francis have observed, "it may be that the investigator can do no better at the time than to attempt to arrange the individuals in some order or ranking, with reference to the trait in question."[4]

---

[2] Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook, op. cit., p. 184.

[3] L. Festinger and D. Katz (eds.), Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences (Dryden, New York, 1953), p. 255.

The percentage of students in each seminary who responded in the "proper" way to each item was calculated separately for first-year seminarians and for third-year seminarians. The seminaries were then ranked by percentage of favorable responses to the item, the first rank ordering being based on the responses of first-year students and the second rank ordering based on responses of third-year students. The rank order of seminaries on each item was then correlated, using the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient, with the rank orders of all of the other items making up the potential indicators of a particular variable. Again, one set of correlation coefficients was obtained from the rankings of first-year students, and another set from the rankings of third-year students. The mean correlation coefficient for each item was then calculated. For example, item "x," a potential indicator of the charismatic orientation, was correlated with items "a," "b," "c," "d," and "e." Thus ten different correlation coefficients were obtained in this case, since one set of correlations was obtained from first-year students and a second set from the third-year students. The mean correlation coefficient of the ten in this case was used in determining whether or not that particular item was to be selected as an indicator.

Many of the potential indicator items were eliminated upon determining the percentage of seminarians responding appropriately to those items. There were some items, in other words, to which students in many seminaries simply did not respond appropriately. Therefore, in spite of the possibility that these items may have been perfectly good indicators of a variable--theoretically--they had to be eliminated through sheer lack of response. A rule of thumb was established in this regard, which specified that if half or more of the seminaries showed a complete lack of response to the item in question, it was automatically dropped. Such a possibility was real enough, since, in certain items in which the student was asked to check one of perhaps eleven alternative responses, there might be only one response of interest as an indicator of a variable.

---

[4] T. C. McCormick and Roy Francis, Methods of Research in the Behavioral Sciences (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 78.

In order to be selected as an indicator, the mean correlation coefficient of the item could not be associated with greater than a .10 level of significance. The .10 level represented a purely arbitrary decision, although, as it turned out, a rather fortunate one. Empirically, this level proved to be a relatively clear-cut dividing point, in the sense that the items that fell short of that mark tended to fall far short of it, and the items which were subsequently selected as indicators, with but one exception, reached the .05 to the less than .01 levels of significance. The items which "survived" this requirement were not as numerous as might be desired. For example, there were only three indicators of the bureaucratic orientation finally selected. The other orientations had five or six indicators. The items selected as indicators, however, did tend to "hang together" to a statistically significant degree. Thus their claim to validity received at least more support than those items which possessed only face validity. The items selected as indicators of the six major variables in this study are given below. The item number (on the Culver-Bridston Questionnaire) is given in the left hand column, with the exact wording of the original question on the right.

A: Charismatic Orientation

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
28 (a)	2	"In deciding whether to accept a candidate for the ministry, a seminary should be more concerned about: Whether he has a genuine call of God."
28 (c)	1	"It seems to me that a person who is ordained without a distinct certainty of being called by God to the ministry: Commits a serious error--even a sin in some cases."
28 (d)	1	"I think that a person should enter the ministry: only if he is certain it is God's will."
49	0	"How important do you consider each of the following in determining who will become effective ministers?" Under the "very important" column: "Having a definite call to the ministry."

B: Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
29 (B)	8	"Listed below are some activities of ministers. How would you rate each as describing . . . (B) the importance in the work of any minister, and (C) the enjoyment you would expect in doing them." Under (B), in the "relatively important" column: "Community leadership."
29 (C)	8	Same item as above, except that column "C" is pertinent. Under the "probably enjoyable" column: "Community leadership."
53 (B)	3	"Listed below are different terms used to describe the same profession. Please indicate . . . (B) which term you would most like to have used for yourself when you are qualified." Under column "B": "Minister."
54 (a)	4	"What seems to be the greatest deficiency of ministers you have known?" Response: "Lack of social and political awareness."

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
55	6	"If you have seriously hesitated about going to seminary, what was the chief reason?" Response: "Feeling of the irrelevance of the ministry for contemporary problems."

C: Intrinsic Religiosity

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
22	5,8,9	"How would you describe your relationships to God and the church? Circle all the responses which most nearly describe your experience." Pertinent responses are: "I had a conversion experience before joining the church;" "My relation to God is through Christ, but not really through the organized church;" and "My relation to God is immediate and direct, having little to do with my feeling of belonging to the church."
56 (both columns)	1	"How would you describe your theological position?" First column--"On Entering College:" Response: "Fundamentalist."

D: Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
29 (B)	1,4,5	"Listed below are some activities of ministers. How would you rate each as describing. . . (B) the importance in the work of any minister. . ." Responses: (Under "relatively important" column) "Studying and preparing sermons;" "Officiating at Worship;" and "Pastoral counseling."

E: Bureaucratic Orientation

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
29 (C)	7	"Listed below are some activities of ministers. How would you rate each as describing. . . (C) the enjoyment you would expect in doing them." Response: "Denominational and committee work." (under "probably enjoyable" column)
54 (a)	8	"What seems to be the greatest deficiency of the ministers you have known?" Response: "Ineptness in organizational matters."

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
54 (b)	5	"The deficiency circled above can best be overcome in the future by:" Response: "Emphasis in seminary on organizational problems of church."

F: Extrinsic Religiosity

Item Number	Response	Wording of Item
22	7,0	"How would you describe your relationships to God and the church? Circle all the responses which most nearly describe your experience." Responses: "I have not had an experience which I would regard as conversion;" and "I am more confident about my belonging to the church than about my relation to God."
29 (C)	0	"Listed below are some activities of ministers. How would you rate each as describing . . . (C) the enjoyment you would expect in doing them." Under the column entitled "Probably not enjoyable," the response is: "Private devotions, prayer, Bible study."
56	6,6	"How would you describe your theological position?" Under both the first column, "On Entering College," and the second column, "At This Time," response is: "Ecumenical."

The mean Spearman rank correlation coefficient (r_s) for each of the indicators of the six major variables, together with its level of significance, is given in Table 2.

The Assignment of Scores

After the indicators of the variables were selected, the next step was to assign scores to each group of seminary students in the sample--first to the first-year students, then to the third-year students, and then to the seminary itself and to the denomination as a whole. As was mentioned earlier in the paper, group scores rather than individual scores were used in this study. Aside from the considerably greater

TABLE 2

MEAN SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE INDICATORS OF THE VARIABLES OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION

Variable	Item No.	Response	Mean r_s	Level of Significance
Charismatic Orientation	28 (a)	2	.72	.0005
	28 (c)	1	.67	.0005
	28 (d)	1	.70	.0005
	28 (e)	2	.32	$>.05$, $<.10$
	49	0	.70	.0005
Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation	29 (B)	8	.35	.05
	29 (C)	8	.35	.05
	53 (B)	3	.35	.05
	54 (a)	4	.35	.05
	55	6	.40	.05
Intrinsic Religiosity	22	5	.39	.05
	22	8	.42	.025
	22	9	.40	.05
	56 (col. 1)	1	.39	.05
	56 (col. 2)	1	.50	.01
Mastery of Communication Skills	29 (B)	1	.64	.0005
	29 (B)	4	.63	.005
	29 (B)	5	.64	.0005
	29 (C)	1	.49	.01
	29 (C)	4	.52	.005
	29 (C)	5	.57	.005
Bureaucratic	29 (C)	7	.34	.05
	54 (a)	8	.34	.05
	54 (b)	5	.44	.025
Extrinsic Religiosity	22	7	.39	.05
	22	0	.44	.025
	29 (C)	0	.34	.05
	56 (I)	6	.40	.05
	56 (II)	6	.48	.01

technical difficulties which would have arisen in dealing with individual scores, there seemed no real advantage in obtaining such scores, since the study is basically a cross-sectional rather than a longitudinal one. Ideally, the same individuals should have been compared on a kind of "before-after" basis, but since this was not possible, it was decided that group scores would suffice for the specific purposes of this study.

The separate indicators of each variable were not scored individually. Instead, a group score for the variable as a whole was computed. The score on a variable was based on the percentage of the possible number of "favorable" responses to the indicators of the variable in question. For example, seminary X might have fifty first-year students. To obtain the score of this group on the charismatic orientation, for which there are five indicators, the computation is based on the fact that there is a total of 250 possible "favorable" responses to these indicators for that group. If, then, the group gave 125 such responses, a score of 50 per cent on the charismatic orientation would be assigned that group. The score for the third-year students in the same seminary would then be computed in the same manner. The score for the seminary as a whole was computed, not simply by taking the mean of the first-year and third-year students, but by computing a "weighted" mean which took into account the differing proportions of first-year and third-year students in each of the seminaries. Extending the computations farther, the score for the entire denomination was obtained by precisely the same method as was used to arrive at the score for a particular seminary, except that the total responses of two, three or more seminaries were used to determine the figure.

To find the final "professionalism score" for a particular seminary, the mean score for the six variables was computed. These six separate scores could not simply be added up to obtain the mean, however, since three of the six variables are presumed to have an inverse sort of relationship with "professionalism"--namely, the charismatic, humanitarian-reformist, and intrinsic religiosity orientations. For those three variables, therefore, the "reciprocal" score was obtained for each seminary. For example, if the intrinsic religiosity score for seminary X turned out to be .377, its "reciprocal," .623, would represent the seminary's "professionalism" score on that particular variable. The reciprocals for the above-mentioned variables were added to the "regular" scores on the three variables which presumably are directly related with professionalism--namely, the bureaucratic, mastery of communications skills and extrinsic religiosity orientations. The mean for the six scores was then computed, giving the professionalism score for the seminary. The same procedure was used to obtain the professionalism score for the denomination as a whole, except that, again, the total responses of a group of seminaries on the six variables were used. From there it was not difficult to assign a sort of composite professionalism score to categories larger than denominations. For example, if our purpose was to assign a professionalism score to all Baptist seminary groups, we would simply follow the scoring procedures described above, except that we would use the responses of all of the Southern Baptist seminaries as well as all of the American Baptist seminaries in obtaining this "composite" Baptist score.

It should be emphasized that the scores thus obtained, though based on percentages, can surely not be considered to be anything more exacting than ordinal data. It would be naive to interpret a professionalism score of 44.6 as meaning that the seminary is 44.6 per cent "professionalized," or that such a seminary is twice as professional as another seminary with a score of 22.3. These scores, then, are simply devices to facilitate the ranking of seminaries along several dimensions.

Methods of Testing the Hypotheses

There remains in this chapter the task of determining the specific methods by which the eight hypotheses proposed in the first chapter are to be tested. Each hypothesis is re-stated below, and is discussed individually.

Hypothesis 1. The greater the length of the seminarians' professional training: (a) the lesser the degree of charismatic orientation; (b) the lesser the degree of humanitarian-reformist orientation; (c) the lesser the degree of intrinsic religiosity; (d) the greater the degree of mastery of communications skills orientation; (e) the greater the degree of bureaucratic orientation; and (f) the greater the degree of extrinsic religiosity.

Basically, this hypothesis was tested by comparing the group scores of first-year students and third-year students within each of the twenty-four seminaries. In effect, this amounted to twenty-four separate tests of the hypothesis. Before the hypothesis could be considered as having received empirical support from the data, it had to pass two tests --(1) the predicted changes outlined in hypothesis 1 had to occur in a statistically significant number of the seminaries in the sample, and (2) the differences in the group scores of first-year students and third-year students in each seminary had to be statistically significant. For both of these requirements, the level of significance was set at .05.

Hypothesis 2. Seminarians who are sons of clergymen, in contrast with all other seminarians at comparable levels of professional training, will exhibit: (a) a lesser degree of charismatic orientation; (b) a lesser degree of humanitarian-reformist orientation; (c) a lesser degree of intrinsic religiosity; (d) a greater degree of mastery of communications skills orientation; (e) a greater degree of bureaucratic orientation; and (f) a greater degree of extrinsic religiosity.

The sons of clergymen were scored as a group at both the first-year and third-year levels, and were then compared to their colleagues in each seminary at comparable stages of training but whose fathers were not clergymen. The scores of the latter group, of course, had to be recomputed after the sons of clergymen were sorted out. This hypothesis required, as did hypothesis 1, that a significantly large number of seminaries exhibit the predicted differences between the sons of clergymen versus all other students; that these differences be statistically significant; and in addition, that the significant differences between sons of clergy and all other students be demonstrated at both the first-year and the third-year levels in a significantly large number of seminaries. Again, the .05 level of significance was used.

Hypothesis 3. The greater the professionalistic emphasis of the seminary, as reflected by its curriculum, the greater will be the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) exhibited by its seminarians.

The central problem involved in testing this hypothesis was the determination of what types of courses in the seminary curriculum would constitute a "professionalistic" emphasis. Theoretically, the problem was not overly difficult, since it could be argued that those courses which stress the mastery of communications skills, the bureaucratic orientation and extrinsic religiosity would be the "professionalistic" courses in the curriculum. Attempting to locate the presence of these variables in the curriculum--let alone trying to assess their "intensity"--proved to be a bit more difficult.

A copy of the seminary bulletin was obtained from all twenty-four seminaries. It was decided that the best indication of the seminary's professionalistic emphasis would be reflected, not in the total number of professionalistic courses offered in the entire curriculum, but rather in the number of such courses required of all B.D. candidates as compared to the total number of all courses required of B.D. candidates. The "semester credit" was adopted as the unit of measurement, which necessitated some computation in adjusting the requirements of seminaries on other systems of credit to that unit of measurement.

Occasionally, the task of selecting which of the required courses meets the specifications of the "professionalistic emphasis" was made easy. In one seminary, for instance, the courses were neatly arranged into four fields--the Biblical, the Historical, the Theological and the Professional. The fourth division in this case turned out to be the only one which included the kinds of courses which could logically be classed as "professionalistic" in their emphasis. That kind of curriculum, however, was the exception rather than the rule. More typically, it was necessary to seek out the professionalistic courses by means of a careful examination of the descriptions of courses in several areas. Examples of the course titles which would clearly fit the category of professionalistic emphasis would be: Preaching, Homiletics, Practicum in Pastoral Responsibility, Church Administration, Clinical Pastoral Training, Pastoral Counseling, Educational Ministry of the Church, Communications, Voice Production for Preachers, and Liturgics. In general, then, the "professionalistic" courses seemed to have as their primary purpose (a) the building of communications techniques--ranging from sermon delivery and officiating at worship to the art of counseling or teaching in church-related programs--or (b) the goal of administering efficiently the ongoing affairs of the local congregational group, particularly as they relate to the structural demands of the denomination as a whole.

The "professionalistic emphasis" score assigned each seminary on the basis of its curriculum, then, is expressed as the proportion of the total number of semester credits required for the degree which can be classified as "professionalistic" in nature. When this score was computed for each seminary, it was easily possible to arrange the seminaries in a rank order. This ranking was then correlated with the rank order of seminaries on each of the six major variables being tested in this study. The hypothesis was considered to be supported if the rank order correlation coefficients thus obtained reached the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 4. The "independent" university-related seminaries will show a greater degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) among their students at both the beginning and concluding stages of professional training than will the denominational seminaries which are formally identified with a particular religious denomination.

The three independent seminaries selected in the sample were scored as a single unit, with respect to each of the six variables, and then compared to the denominationally-affiliated seminaries at both the first-year and the third-year levels. If the group scores thus compared yield statistically significant differences (at the .05 level) in the predicted direction, the hypothesis would be supported.

Hypothesis 5. The higher a seminary ranks on any one of the six criteria of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) the higher it will rank on each of the other criteria of professional socialization.

This hypothesis is offered as a test of the internal consistency of the six major variables being tested. If all these variables are related to the same basic social process--namely, professional socialization--a seminary which ranks high on charismatic orientation, for example, should rank correspondingly high on intrinsic religiosity and low on mastery of skills orientation. The rankings on all six of the variables were intercorrelated, therefore, and if the correlations turned out to be significant at the .05 level, the hypothesis would be supported.

Hypothesis 6. The greater the social prestige enjoyed by a denomination, the greater will be the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) exhibited by its seminarians. The testing of this hypothesis required the rank ordering of the composite professionalism scores computed for each denomination. This rank order was then correlated with the rank order of denominations by social prestige--an ordering which was described in Chapter I. If the rank order correlation coefficient proved significant at the .05 level the hypothesis was regarded as supported.

Hypothesis 7. There will be no significant relationship between the withdrawal (or "dropout") rate of a given seminary and the degree of professional socialization (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above) exhibited by its seminarians.

To test this hypothesis, and the hypothesis to follow, it was necessary to obtain official statistical data on the attrition rates of the two groups in question--that is, the first-year students and the third-year students in each seminary. A written request for this information was sent to each seminary, in which the seminary was asked to furnish two figures: (1) the per cent of the male students entering their seminary in the school year 1960-61, with the intent of pursuing the Bachelor of Divinity degree, who did in fact complete all requirements for that degree; and (2) the per cent of the male students entering that seminary in the 1962-63 school year, intending to pursue the B.D. degree, who did in fact complete all requirements for that degree. The attrition rates for both the first-year and the third-year students in the responding seminaries were thus made available. This permitted the rank ordering of these seminaries by attrition rates of both groups--the first-year and the third-year students. In effect, then, this hypothesis was given two quite independent tests. This was done by correlating the rank order of seminaries by attrition rate of first-year students with the rank order of seminaries by scores of first-year students on each of the six major variables. The same procedure was carried out with the third-year group.

In order for this null hypothesis to be rejected, the rank correlation coefficients obtained for both the first-year and the third-year groups had to be significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 8. The greater the degree of disparity between the professionalistic emphasis of the seminary's curriculum and the degree of professional socialization shown by its seminarians (as given in hypothesis 1 (a) through (f) above), the higher will be the withdrawal (dropout) rate for that seminary.

This hypothesis was tested by comparing the "professionalistic emphasis" ranking as described in hypothesis 3 with the ranking of the seminaries by scores on each of the six major variables of professional socialization (a) for first-year students and (b) third-year students. The differences in these rankings served as the basis for creating new rankings of "disparity" which were then correlated with the rankings of seminary dropout rates--first, for the first-year students, and then for the third-year students. If the rank order correlation coefficients thus obtained are significant at the .05 level for both groups, the hypothesis is supported.

The data obtained on the comparative dropout rates of the first-year and third-year students also served another purpose. This information served as a check on the "comparability" of the first-year group and the third-year group in each seminary. If the difference in attrition rates between these two groups or classes within the same seminary exceeded, say, ten per cent, one might have some reason to doubt the comparability of these groups. Differences of less than ten per cent, on the other hand, would tend to strengthen the assumption of this study that there are probably no significant differences between these two groups in their initial stages of professional training.

A general description of the research methods employed in this study having now been completed, the findings will be presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

THE FINDINGS

The statements to be made in this chapter pertaining to the research findings will be primarily of a descriptive, rather than analytical, nature. The fourth chapter will concentrate on the problems of interpretation. Since the testing of the hypotheses in this study necessitated a great many comparisons within seminaries, between seminaries and between denominations, much of the material presented in this chapter consists of tables.

The testing of the hypotheses relied very heavily upon two statistical techniques. Where rank orders were being correlated, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used. Where scores on variables were being compared, a formula for testing the significance of differences between percentages was employed. This formula, described by G. Milton Smith, is particularly well-suited to this study since group scores, rather than individual ones, were assigned.[1] The discussion of the findings in this chapter will follow the same order in which the hypotheses were originally stated in Chapter I.

Length of Training and Degree of Professional Socialization

The first hypothesis predicted that during the course of seminary training, there would occur a lessening of certain "orientations": (a) the belief that one is called to the ministry by God, (b) that one enters upon training imbued with the expectation that his training will facilitate him in the expression of his altruism and basic concern with the human plight, and (c) that the true theological position stresses the importance of religious experience, conversion, prayer and the life of the spirit. Corresponding to the lessening of these orientations was the predicted strengthening of certain other orientations: (a) the tendency to emphasize technical skills in communication *per se* rather than the nature of the intended message or the particular problems in the lives of the audience, (b) the desire to be a "good bureaucrat" in the sense of acting as a devoted and efficient administrator-representative of his denomination, and (c) the belief that a man's relationship to God depends not on any mystical inner experiences but on a high degree of obedience to and involvement with the activities of the organized church.

---

[1] The rationale for this formula is given in G. Milton Smith, *A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 3rd Edition, 1962), pp. 78-80.

Therefore, the third-year students in all seminaries were expected to show significant differences in these orientations as compared to the responses of first-year students. The differences in the scores assigned to these two classes of students in each of the twenty-four seminaries in the sample are presented in six tables--Tables 1-A, 1-C, 1-E, 1-G, 1-I and 1-K--with each table showing the scores assigned on one particular variable. In addition, the total number of respondents in each group (N) is given. The "t" score indicates the significance of the difference between first-year and third-year scores for each seminary, thus permitting the use of probability statements. According to the table given in Smith's book, a t-score of at least 1.94 would be required to attain the .05 level of significance.

A. *Charismatic Orientation*: Table 1-A reveals that the charismatic orientation did not decline to any extent between first-year and third-year students as a whole. In fact, third-year students showed a higher level of charismatic orientation than their first-year colleagues in twelve of the twenty-four seminaries. The only difference in scores which reached the .05 level of significance occurred in one Methodist seminary, and this was a difference in the predicted direction. The most interesting fact to emerge from this table is the remarkably wide interdenominational range of scores in both the first-year and third-year groups. While one of the independent seminaries scores .262 on this orientation, for example, a Southern Baptist seminary scored..921.

Table 1-B deals with the same data, but at the denominational level rather than by particular seminaries. Five denominations of the ten in the sample show lower charismatic orientation scores among their third-year students. The most significant difference is noted in the Disciples of Christ denomination, followed by the Episcopalians and Methodists. None of these changes, however, approaches the .05 level of significance.

Part (a) of hypothesis 1 is clearly not supported by the data, either in the number of seminaries showing the predicted differences nor in the actual significance of the differences which were observed.

B. *Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation*: From Table 1-C it can be seen that third-year students showed a lesser degree of the humanitarian-reformist orientation in only ten of the twenty-four seminaries. The differences in first-year and third-year scores show results contrary to hypothesis 1-b in fourteen seminaries. None of the seminaries shows a

TABLE 1-A

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON CHARISMATIC ORIENTATION (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.882	44	.888	59	.09427
SB-2	.921	213	.924	237	.11878
M-1	.519	64	.575	63	.63490
M-2	.561	82	.401	72	2.00952*
M-3	.610	42	.575	40	.32260
UP-1	.600	48	.618	34	.16470
UP-2	.513	112	.485	96	.40278
AB-1	.403	68	.442	38	.38944
AB-2	.507	15	.592	25	.52388
AB-3	.738	13	.691	11	.25383
E-1	.608	26	.485	33	.95078
E-2	.500	36	.514	7	.06780
E-3	.452	23	.333	30	.88273
LCA-1	.536	28	.603	67	.60034
LCA-2	.383	12	.355	9	.13179
LCA-3	.600	21	.500	28	.70087
ALC-1	.413	31	.438	69	.23427
P-1	.743	46	.735	43	.08586
UCC-1	.526	19	.533	33	.04869
DC-1	.504	23	.285	33	1.66749
DC-2	.453	19	.391	23	.40535
I-1	.327	74	.315	61	.14871
I-2	.275	67	.306	49	.36258
I-3	.262	42	.411	19	1,13136

*Statistically significant at .04 level.

TABLE 1-B

DIFFERENCES IN THE SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON CHARISMATIC ORIENTATION (BY DENOMINATION)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.914	257	.917	296	.13043
Methodist	.564	188	.506	175	1.10877
United Presbyterian	.521	160	.520	130	.01695
American Baptist	.476	96	.530	74	.69922
Episcopal	.520	85	.423	70	1.21031
Lutheran Church in America	.527	61	.554	104	.33750
American Lutheran	.413	31	.438	69	.23427
Presbyterian,U.S.	.743	46	.735	43	.08586
United Church of Christ	.526	19	.533	33	.04869
Disciples of Christ	.481	42	.329	56	1.52875

difference which is significant at the .05 level. The two Southern Baptist seminaries come closest to any significant difference between first-year and third-year students, and, contrary to expectations, the differences in scores reveal the third-year students in those seminaries as possessing a greater degree of this orientation than the first-year students.

Table 1-D indicates that on the denominational level, only four denominations out of ten conformed to predictions, while the other six denominations showed an increase in this orientation from first to the third years. The most significant change in either direction was among the Southern Baptists, in which case the observed difference in scores reached the .10 level. The only other possibly noteworthy difference occurred among the United Presbyterians, whose difference in scores reached the .20 level of significance. Part (b) of hypothesis 1, therefore, was obviously not supported.

C. Intrinsic Religiosity: Differences in Intrinsic Religiosity, as Table 1-E demonstrates, followed the expectations stated in the hypothesis much more closely than was the case with either of the previous orientations. While the first to third year differences are not statistically significant, taken singly, it is noteworthy that twenty-one of the twenty-four seminaries showed lower scores for their third-year students than for their first-year students. Using the Sign Test to determine the probability that chance factors could account for twenty-one of twenty-four changes occurring in the predicted direction, the probability was found to be at the .001 level. As was the case with the charismatic orientation scores, the intrinsic religiosity scores showed a wide inter-

TABLE 1-C

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON HUMANITARIANISM-REFORMIST ORIENTATION (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.118	44	.186	59	.96832
SB-2	.117	213	.160	237	1.32567
M-1	.281	64	.213	63	.89153
M-2	.241	82	.239	72	.02899
M-3	.219	42	.215	40	.04392
UP-1	.213	48	.259	34	.48123
UP-2	.311	112	.323	96	.18536
AB-1	.274	68	.268	38	.06671
AB-2	.267	15	.232	25	.23344
AB-3	.123	13	.164	11	.28454
E-1	.223	26	.152	33	.69058
E-2	.139	36	.143	7	.02771
E-3	.226	23	.227	30	.08621
LCA-1	.107	28	.170	67	.84806
LCA-2	.150	12	.067	9	.62615
LCA-3	.229	21	.150	28	.69391
ALC-1	.135	31	.188	69	.68548
P-1	.200	46	.233	43	.37768
UCC-1	.137	19	.170	33	.32207
DC-1	.200	23	.299	33	.85818
DC-2	.200	19	.235	23	.27467
I-1	.349	74	.305	61	.54386
I-2	.346	67	.282	49	.73854
I-3	.381	42	.421	19	.29452

TABLE 1-D

DIFFERENCES IN THE SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON HUMANITARIAN-REFORMIST ORIENTATION (BY DENOMINATION)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.118	257	.166	296	1.62485
Methodist	.250	188	.224	175	.58275
United Presbyterian	.233	160	.306	130	1.39193
American Baptist	.252	96	.241	74	.17460
Episcopal	.188	85	.183	70	.08064
Lutheran Church in America	.157	61	.156	104	.01706
American Lutheran	.135	31	.188	69	.68548
Presbyterian,U.S.	.200	46	.233	43	.37768
United Church of Christ	.137	19	.170	33	.32207
Disciples of Christ	.200	42	.232	56	.38271

denominational spread, ranging from .047 in an Episcopal seminary to .425 in a Southern Baptist one.

The evidence from Table 1-F indicates that on the denominational level, nine of the ten denominations were found to have lower scores among their third-year seminarians than among the first-year ones. The probability for this occurrence, again using the Sign Test, reaches the .02 level. The United Presbyterians showed the most significant change of all the denominations (p=.15), though this change did not reach the .05 level previously specified as significant. Following that denomination, in order of significance of difference in scores, were the Disciples of Christ, Southern Baptists and United Church of Christ, all of whom ranged from the .20 to..30 level of significance. The American Baptist church proved to be the lone exception to the rule in this orientation, showing a slight increase in intrinsic religiosity from first to third-year groups. Part (c) of the first hypothesis, therefore, was supported to some extent, in that the number of seminaries showing the predicted direction of change was statistically significant. The significance of the actual differences in each case, however, fell short of the .05 level.

D. Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation: Examination of Table 1-G reveals that the predicted increase in the mastery of communications skills orientation, from first to third year, did occur in eighteen of the twenty-four seminaries. This occurrence is significant at the .119 level by the Sign Test. One Baptist seminary showed a difference in the predicted direction which proved to be significant at the .002 level. None of the other seminaries showed changes which reached the .05 level, the closest approach being found in seminary E-1, where the significance

TABLE 1-E

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON INTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.423	44	.403	59	.20386
SB-2	.425	213	.373	237	1.12563
M-1	.191	64	.143	63	.72697
M-2	.146	82	.122	72	.47358
M-3	.195	42	.205	40	.11314
UP-1	.175	48	.124	34	.64756
UP-2	.214	112	.144	96	1.32624
AB-1	.153	68	.158	38	.06799
AB-2	.267	15	.264	25	.02079
AB-3	.415	13	.273	11	.74105
E-1	.138	26	.055	33	1.05836
E-2	.050	36	.057	7	.07379
E-3	.052	23	.047	30	.08291
LCA-1	.100	28	.057	67	.67849
LCA-2	.117	12	.089	9	.21095
LCA-3	.133	21	.107	28	.27554
ALC-1	.174	31	.145	69	.36156
P-1	2.09	46	.167	43	.50824
UCC-1	.200	19	.086	33	1.09681
DC-1	.200	23	.115	33	.84828
DC-2	.263	19	.157	23	.83916
I-1	.149	74	.105	61	.77133
I-2	.140	67	.065	49	1.36087
I-3	.167	42	.126	19	.42960

TABLE 1-F

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS IN INTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY (BY DENOMINATION)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.425	257	.379	296	1.10087
Methodist	.172	188	.149	175	.59743
United Presbyterian	.203	160	.138	130	1.48101
American Baptist	.206	96	.211	74	.07592
Episcopal	.078	85	.051	70	.68859
Lutheran Church in America	.115	61	.073	104	.87214
American Lutheran	.174	31	.145	69	.36156
Presbyterian, U.S.	.209	46	.167	43	.50824
United Church of Christ	.200	19	.086	33	1.09681
Disciples of Christ	.229	42	.125	56	1.31645

was at the .10 level.

On the denominational level, as shown in Table 1-H, the Southern Baptist seminaries combined to produce a significance of difference score which was at the .002 level. The Episcopal Church also indicated a rather striking difference in mastery of communications skills orientation scores in the predicted direction, though this difference was significant at only the .10 level. Eight of the ten denominations were found to exhibit differences in the predicted direction, with the exceptions being the Lutheran Church in America and the American Baptist Church. The latter denomination, in fact, showed a decline in this orientation which was significant at the .15 level.

Hypothesis 1 (d), in view of these findings, was partially supported, though not conclusively so. The number of seminaries which evidenced the predicted differences in this case was quite suggestive, though not significant at the .05 level. And, of course, the difference within each of the seminaries, with but one exception, did not attain the requisite level of statistical significance.

E. Bureaucratic Orientation: As the data presented in Table 1-I demonstrate, twelve of the twenty-four seminaries show a decline in bureaucratic orientation scores, contrary to the predicted direction. None of the differences between first-year and third-year scores is significant at the .05 level. It is interesting to observe that the most significant difference to be found in this table, a difference which is significant at the .10 level, represented a sharp reduction in this orientation from first year to third year. In addition, it can be noted that of the next three most significant changes, two of them were likewise

TABLE 1-G

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON MASTERY OF COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS ORIENTATION (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.360	44	.489	59	1.32550
SB-2	.390	213	.532	237	3.05011*
M-1	.570	64	.624	63	.62131
M-2	.522	82	.537	72	.18610
M-3	.607	42	.492	40	1.05296
UP-1	.455	48	.500	34	.40218
UP-2	.601	112	.679	96	1.17436
AB-1	.556	68	.667	38	1.14031
AB-2	.700	15	.547	25	.98943
AB-3	.513	13	.500	11	.06347
E-1	.538	26	.742	33	1.64597
E-2	.542	36	.690	7	.76475
E-3	.609	23	.633	30	.17841
LCA-1	.494	28	.520	67	.23114
LCA-2	.556	12	.389	9	.77047
LCA-3	.667	21	.589	28	.56259
ALC-1	.634	31	.705	69	.69291
P-1	.446	46	.473	43	.25549
UCC-1	.386	19	.551	33	1.16758
DC-1	.486	23	.551	33	.47973
DC-2	.456	19	.486	23	.19398
I-1	.646	74	.702	61	.69354
I-2	.711	67	.642	49	.78341
I-3	.706	42	.746	19	.32753

*Significant at the .002 level.

TABLE 1-H

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON MASTERY OF COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS ORIENTATION (BY DENOMINATION)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.385	257	.524	296	3.30957*
Methodist	.557	188	.558	175	.01917
United Presbyterian	.557	160	.632	130	1.29945
American Baptist	.707	96	.601	74	1.44270
Episcopal	.559	85	.690	70	1.69745
Lutheran Church in America	.566	61	.527	104	.48660
American Lutheran	.634	31	.705	69	.69291
Presbyterian, U.S.	.446	46	.473	43	.25549
United Church of Christ	.386	19	.551	33	1.16758
Disciples of Christ	.472	42	.524	56	.51020

*Significant at the .002 level.

in the direction of "decrease" rather than the predicted "increase."

Viewing these findings from the denominational perspective, it can be seen that the Episcopal Church was the most "internally consistent," in that its three seminaries all showed distinct trends in the same direction--namely, a lessening of bureaucratic orientation throughout seminary training. From Table 1-J, it is evident that the only two denominations approaching statistical significance in Bureaucratic scores are the Episcopal and the United Presbyterian. The significance of difference in scores in those cases ranges from the .20 to the .25 levels. Only five of the ten denominations in the sample indicated any changes in the predicted direction. Clearly, hypothesis 1 (e) received no empirical support from the data.

F. Extrinsic Religiosity: Table 1-K reveals only a very slight overall trend from lesser to greater degrees of extrinsic religiosity through the course of seminary training. Thirteen of the twenty-four seminaries show differences in scores in the predicted direction. The observed differences in scores between first-year and third-year students were of very minor significance in practically all cases. The Methodist seminary, which indicated the most significant of all seminary changes in this variable, was found to possess significance at somewhat less than the .20 level. A cursory review of this table is sufficient to indicate the lowness of the scores, on an "across-the-board" basis, for this particular variable. All of the Southern Baptist scores on extrinsic religiosity, for example, are less than .01, and the highest score--assigned to an Episcopal seminary--was only .233.

Viewing these data from the denominational level, as is done in

TABLE 1-I

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON BUREAUCRATIC ORIENTATION (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.083	44	.113	59	.51234
SB-2	.100	213	.101	237	.03523
M-1	.052	64	.042	63	.26641
M-2	.077	82	.102	72	.54056
M-3	.127	42	.067	40	.92554
UP-1	.042	48	.069	34	.51698
UP-2	.131	112	.063	96	1.68360
AB-1	.113	68	.140	38	.39627
AB-2	.178	15	.113	25	.55071
AB-3	.128	13	.182	11	.36308
E-1	.179	26	.071	33	1.23471
E-2	.046	36	.000	7	1.31752
E-3	.043	23	.011	30	.68984
LCA-1	.107	28	.075	67	.47981
LCA-2	.056	12	.074	9	.16419
LCA-3	.095	21	.071	28	.29884
ALC-1	.089	31	.101	69	.19139
P-1	.116	46	.109	43	.10449
UCC-1	.070	19	.101	33	.39441
DC-1	.145	23	.172	33	.27406
DC-2	.018	19	.101	23	1.18837
I-1	.045	74	.049	61	.10908
I-2	.065	67	.061	49	.08779
I-3	.056	42	.070	19	.20454

TABLE 1-J

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON BUREAUCRATIC ORIENTATION (BY DENOMINATION)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.097	257	.104	296	.27338
Methodist	.080	188	.072	175	.28769
United Presbyterian	.104	160	.064	130	1.23844
American Baptist	.125	96	.144	74	.35874
Episcopal	.086	85	.038	70	1.26186
Lutheran Church in America	.093	61	.074	104	.42049
American Lutheran	.089	31	.101	69	.19139
Presbyterian, U.S.	.116	46	.109	43	.10449
United Church of Christ	.070	19	.101	33	.39441
Disciples of Christ	.087	42	.143	56	.87675

Table 1-L, it is at once clear that not a single denomination shows anything approaching statistical significance in its differences in scores. The two denominations coming closest to having significant differences--the United Presbyterians and the Methodists--do indicate a change in the predicted direction, though their level of significance is only slightly less than .30. Despite the lack of significant differences between first-year and third-year scores in all of the seminaries, it is worth noting that eight of the ten denominations show changes in extrinsic religiosity scores in the predicted direction. The Sign Test indicates that this occurrence attains the .145 level of significance.

Hypothesis 1 (f), therefore, receives only very slight support from the data. The overall trend seems to be in the direction of greater extrinsic religiosity among third-year seminarians than first-year ones, but neither the number of seminaries showing this trend nor the extent of differences between first-year and third-year groups even approaches the .05 level of significance.

Sons of Clergy vs. Other Seminarians

The second hypothesis proposed in Chapter I predicted that seminarians who are sons of clergymen will exhibit higher degrees of professional socialization at both the initial and advanced stages of training than will the other seminarians. Before the hypothesis could be tested adequately it was necessary to consider denominations as the basic units of analysis rather than seminaries, since some seminaries contained no seminarians who were sons of clergymen. Other seminaries contained only one or two cases. In two instances, denominations were combined under one heading. This occurred with the Lutherans (a combination of the

TABLE 1-K

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON EXTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY (BY SEMINARY)

Seminary	1st Year	N	3rd Year	N	t
SB-1	.009	44	.003	59	.37692
SB-2	.003	213	.005	237	.33790
M-1	.078	64	.057	63	.47391
M-2	.068	82	.136	72	1.38664
M-3	.038	42	.085	40	.88589
UP-1	.080	48	.106	34	.39555
UP-2	.102	112	.146	96	.95638
AB-1	.141	68	.111	38	.45340
AB-2	.080	15	.040	25	.49834
AB-3	.015	13	.036	11	.32057
E-1	.100	26	.109	33	.11246
E-2	.094	36	.029	7	.81324
E-3	.174	23	.233	30	.53403
LCA-1	.121	28	.182	67	.78616
LCA-2	.133	12	.089	9	.32247
LCA-3	.124	21	.071	28	.61084
ALC-1	.090	31	.136	69	.69786
P-1	.074	46	.037	43	.76846
UCC-1	.084	19	.152	33	.76238
DC-1	.122	23	.121	33	.01127
I-1	.205	74	.174	61	.45915
I-2	.227	67	.200	49	.35198
I-3	.157	42	.232	19	.67005

TABLE 1-L

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES OF FIRST-YEAR SEMINARIANS AND THIRD-YEAR SEMINARIANS ON EXTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY (BY DENOMINATIONS)

Denomination	1st Yr.	N	3rd Yr.	N	t
Southern Baptist	.004	257	.005	296	.17593
Methodist	.065	188	.096	175	1.08311
United Presbyterian	.094	160	.135	130	1.08401
American Baptist	.115	96	.074	74	.87008
Episcopal	.118	85	.154	70	.64808
Lutheran Church in America	.125	61	.169	104	.78479
American Lutheran	.090	31	.136	69	.69786
Presbyterian, U.S.	.074	46	.037	43	.76846
United Church of Christ	.084	19	.152	33	.76238
Disciples of Christ	.124	42	.129	56	.07462

Lutheran Church in America and the American Lutheran Church) and the Presbyterians (a combination of United Presbyterian Church and Presbyterian, U.S.). The "Independents" were considered, for comparison purposes, as a "denomination."

The total of 204 sons of clergymen in the sample represented 8.9% of all of the seminarians in the study, and included a total of 109 first-year students and 95 third-year ones. Each of the six "orientations" was given, in effect, two independent tests to determine the significance of the differences in scores between the sons of clergy versus all other students at both the first-year and the third-year levels.

A. Charismatic Orientation: On charismatic orientation scores there proved to be no statistically significant differences between the sons of clergy vs. all other students--at either the first-year or third-year level. The general direction of the differences, however, went as predicted. At the first-year level, for example, six of the nine denominational groups showed lower scores for their sons of clergymen than for the other students. At the third-year level, as shown on Table 2-A, the sons of clergymen scored lower on the charismatic orientation in seven of the nine denominations. This result is significant at the .227 level by the Sign Test. It can be concluded, then, that hypothesis 2 (a) is given some support by the data, but not to a statistically significant degree.

B. Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation: Table 2-B indicates that at the first-year level, only five of the nine denominations show

TABLE 2-A

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS ON CHARISMATIC ORIENTATION

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.880 (N=20)	.915 (N=237)	.46737	.914 (N=14)	.917 (N=282)	.03910
Methodist	.527 (N=22)	.561 (N=166)	.30035	.560 (N=15)	.501 (N=160)	.43989
Presbyterian	.563 (N=16)	.584 (N=190)	.16272	.571 (N=14)	.574 (N=159)	.02174
American Baptist	.400 (N=7)	.470 (N=89)	.36350	.560 (N=5)	.528 (N=69)	.13914
Episcopal	.600 (N=6)	.431 (N=79)	.81400	.280 (N=5)	.434 (N=65)	.73334
Lutheran	.473 (N=11)	.491 (N=81)	.11218	.470 (N=20)	.512 (N=153)	.35385
United Church of Christ	.600 (N=2)	518 (N=17)	.22343	.400 (N=3)	.547 (N=30)	.49480
Disciples of Christ	.600 (N=2)	.425 (N=40)	.49279	.133 (N=3)	.340 (N=53)	1.00208
Independent	.243 (N=23)	.300 (N=160)	.59073	.275 (N=16)	.333 (N=113)	.48289

TABLE 2-B

DIFFERENCES IN THE SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS IN THE HUMANITARIAN-REFORMIST ORIENTATION

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.130 (N=20)	.091 (N=237)	.50332	.171 (N=14)	.165 (N=282)	.05823
Methodist	.245 (N=22)	.251 (N=166)	.06143	.240 (N=15)	.223 (N=160)	.14773
Presbyterian	.363 (N=16)	.260 (N=190)	.82826	.243 (N=14)	.292 (N=159)	.40777
American Baptist	.400 (N=7)	.288 (N=89)	.58551	.440 (N=5)	.226 (N=69)	.94012
Episcopal	.166 (N=6)	.189 (N=79)	.14542	.280 (N=5)	.175 (N=65)	.50908
Lutheran	.109 (N=11)	.175 (N=81)	.64070	.210 (N=20)	.162 (N=153)	.50091
United Church of Christ	.200 (N=2)	.071 (N=17)	.44541	.133 (N=3)	.240 (N=30)	.50713
Disciples of Christ	.100 (N=2)	.105 (N=40)	.02298	.400 (N=3)	.223 (N=53)	.61338
Independent	.322 (N=23)	.354 (N=160)	.03621	.313 (N=16)	.313 (N=113)	.00000

the sons of clergymen to have lower scores on humanitarian-reformism than their colleagues. None of these differences is significant. On the third-year level, there is an interesting reversal. Six denominations show that the sons of clergymen have higher scores than their colleagues on this variable, one denomination shows no difference between them, and only two denominations concur with expectations. This "reversal" is not, however, significant statistically. There are no significant differences between sons of clergymen and other seminary students at the third-year level. Hypothesis 2 (b), therefore, is obviously not supported by the evidence.

C. Intrinsic Religiosity: The data on intrinsic religiosity scores, from Table 2-C, point to a general difference between the sons of clergy and the other students, in the predicted manner. Again, however, the differences do not reach the .05 level of significance except in two instances. At the first-year level, the United Church of Christ's sons of clergymen score differs quite strikingly from the score of the other students, a difference which proved significant at the .04 level. Also, in the scores of the Episcopal Church at the third-year level, the difference between sons of clergymen versus all other students achieves a significance of .05. It is interesting that there wasn't a single intrinsic religiosity "response" given by a United Church of Christ seminarian who was a son of a clergyman. The American Baptist Church represents another denomination with rather striking differences between these two classes of students. The sons of clergymen show lesser degrees of intrinsic religiosity at both first and third-year levels, with the significance of the differences reaching the .10 level for both years.

TABLE 2-C

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS ON INTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.390 (N=20)	.427 (N=237)	.32542	.343 (N=14)	.369 (N=282)	.19987
Methodist	.100 (N=22)	.182 (N=166)	1.16108	.107 (N=15)	.136 (N=160)	.34406
Presbyterian	.188 (N=16)	.205 (N=190)	.16671	.171 (N=14)	.143 (N=159)	.26824
American Baptist	.057 (N=7)	.216 (N=89)	1.62436	.080 (N=5)	.220 (N=69)	1.06727
Episcopal	.067 (N=6)	.063 (N=79)	.03785	.000 (N=5)	.055 (N=65)	1.94501**
Lutheran	.073 (N=11)	.143 (N=81)	.79955	.110 (N=20)	.101 (N=153)	.12148
United Church of Christ	.000 (N=2)	.224 (N=17)	2.21522*	.000 (N=3)	.087 (N=30)	1.69077
Disciples of Christ	.300 (N=2)	.225 (N=40)	.22680	.133 (N=3)	.125 (N=2)	.03975
Independent	.122 (N=23)	.153 (N=160)	.41926	.088 (N=16)	.094 (N=113)	.07899

*Significant at the .04 level.
**Significant at the .05 level.

Thus it can be concluded that although statistical significance is again lacking, hypothesis 2 (c) is supported to a limited extent by the data.

D. Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation: The data pertaining to the differences in scores on the mastery of communications skills orientation are given in Table 2-D. In terms of the number of denominational groupings which followed the expectations of the hypothesis, there were only four of the nine denominations at the first-year level, and five of nine at the third-year level. There is no score difference in this table which achieves the .05 level of significance. The only denomination to show consistency, in the sense that the predicted difference in scores occurred at both first and third-year levels, was the American Baptist Church. At the third-year level in that denomination, the difference in scores was significant at less than the .10 level. The other eight denominations were inconsistent, in that at one level the sons of clergymen scored lower than the other students, and at the other level, higher than their colleagues. Hypothesis 2 (d) is not supported.

E. Bureaucratic Orientation: The bureaucratic orientation scores are presented in Table 2-E. At the first-year level, only four of the nine denominations conform to the expectation that sons of clergymen are more "bureaucratically-oriented" than are other seminary students. The most significant difference at this level occurred in the case of the Disciples of Christ, with the sons of clergymen scoring significantly lower scores than the other students. The significance of that difference was at the .04 level. The most significant difference in the predicted direction

TABLE 2-D

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS
ON MASTERY OF COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS ORIENTATION

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.300 (N=20)	.391 (N=237)	.84840	.536 (N=14)	.517 (N=282)	.13913
Methodist	.530 (N=22)	.560 (N=166)	.26509	.611 (N=15)	.554 (N=160)	.43325
Presbyterian	.563 (N=16)	.530 (N=190)	.25545	.429 (N=14)	.611 (N=159)	1.32065
American Baptist	.690 (N=7)	.566 (N=89)	.67934	.800 (N=5)	.587 (N=69)	1.13027
Episcopal	.361 (N=6)	.575 (N=79)	1.04998	.633 (N=5)	.621 (N=65)	.05362
Lutheran	.485 (N=11)	.603 (N=81)	.73660	.608 (N=20)	.602 (N=153)	.05167
United Church of Christ	.500 (N=2)	.373 (N=17)	.34093	.333 (N=3)	.583 (N=30)	.87229
Disciples of Christ	.500 (N=2)	.471 (N=40)	.08005	.444 (N=3)	.544 (N=53)	.33909
Independent	.565 (N=33)	.694 (N=160)	1.17696	.615 (N=16)	.709 (N=113)	.72905

TABLE 2-E

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS ON THE BUREAUCRATIC ORIENTATION

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.050 (N=20)	.101 (N=237)	.97110	.180 (N=14)	.229 (N=282)	.36181
Methodist	.061 (N=22)	.082 (N=166)	.37981	.067 (N=15)	.083 (N=160)	.23481
Presbyterian	.146 (N=16)	.104 (N=190)	.46148	.000 (N=14)	.193 (N=159)	6.16652**
American Baptist	.429 (N=7)	.101 (N=89)	1.72837	.200 (N=5)	.184 (N=69)	.08655
Episcopal	.056 (N=6)	.088 (N=79)	.32281	.000 (N=5)	.041 (N=65)	1.66701
Lutheran	.152 (N=11)	.082 (N=81)	.62244	.117 (N=20)	.081 (N=153)	.47885
United Church of Christ	.000 (N=2)	.078 (N=17)	1.19924	.222 (N=3)	.078 (N=30)	.58801
Disciples of Christ	.000 (N=2)	.098 (N=40)	2.08468*	.222 (N=3)	.138 (N=53)	.34345
Independent	.116 (N=23)	.046 (N=160)	1.01752	.063 (N=16)	.056 (N=113)	.10857

*Significant at the .04 level.
**Significant at the .00006 level.

existed in the American Baptist Church, where less than the .10 level was reached. Among third-year seminarians, five of the nine denominations show higher scores on the bureaucratic orientation for the sons of clergymen category. Again, however, the most significant differences between the sons of clergymen versus other students exist in denominations in which the sons of clergymen scored lower on the bureaucratic orientation than did other students. Among the Presbyterians, for example, the significance of the difference in scores achieved the .00006 level; and among the Episcopal third-year students the significance was at the .10 level. Part (e) of hypothesis 2, therefore, is definitely unsupported by the data.

F. Extrinsic Religiosity: Table 2-F presents the scores on the extrinsic religiosity variable, and it is again apparent that no "t" score on the entire table is significant at the .05 level. At the first-year level five of the nine denominations indicate that their sons of clergymen scored higher on this variable than did the other students. At the third-year level, six denominations indicate differences in scores in the predicted direction. There is, then, some very slight support for the prediction that sons of clergymen will score higher on this variable than will other seminarians. The number of seminaries showing the predicted differences, however, and the actual significance of the observed differences both fall considerably short of the .05 level of significance. The second hypothesis, part (f), is thus unsupported.

Curricular Emphasis and Professional Socialization

The third hypothesis stated that the greater the professionalistic emphasis in the curriculum of the seminary, the greater the degree of

TABLE 2-F

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES BETWEEN SONS OF CLERGYMEN AND ALL OTHER SEMINARIANS IN EXTRINSIC RELIGIOSITY

Denomination	Sons of Clergy: 1st year	All Others: 1st year	t	Sons of Clergy: 3rd year	All Others: 3rd year	t
Southern Baptist	.000 (N=20)	.004 (N=237)	.09756	.029 (N=14)	.004 (N=282)	.55549
Methodist	.118 (N=22)	.046 (N=166)	1.01873	.107 (N=15)	.095 (N=160)	.14439
Presbyterian	.113 (N=16)	.087 (N=190)	.31806	.086 (N=14)	.114 (N=159)	.35418
American Baptist	.086 (N=7)	.117 (N=89)	.27850	.200 (N=5)	.064 (N=69)	.75016
Episcopal	.033 (N=6)	.113 (N=79)	.98569	.240 (N=5)	.148 (N=65)	.46936
Lutheran	.200 (N=11)	.104 (N=81)	.76626	.140 (N=20)	.165 (N=153)	.30052
United Church of Christ	.000 (N=2)	.094 (N=17)	1.32808	.133 (N=3)	.160 (N=30)	.13033
Disciples of Christ	.200 (N=2)	.120 (N=40)	.27828	.333 (N=3)	.117 (N=53)	.78359
Independent	.278 (N=23)	.191 (N=160)	.88369	.225 (N=16)	.188 (N=113)	.33431

professional socialization of its seminarians. Chapter II described the method by which the seminaries were to be ranked with respect to the professionalistic emphasis of their curricula. Table 3-A presents the professionalistic emphasis scores for the twenty-four seminaries, along with the corresponding rank ordering of these scores.

As was discussed previously, each score is a percentage which indicates the proportion of the total number of semester credits required for the Bachelor of Divinity Degree which can be classed as "professionalistic" in nature. The range of scores on professionalistic emphasis is relatively wide, from an American Baptist seminary's .104 to an Episcopal seminary's .381. It is clear from the rank order of seminaries on Table 3-A that there is very little "clustering" by denomination. The Episcopal seminaries, for instance, are assigned the ranks of 1, 12.5 and 22. The American Baptist seminaries are given the ranks of 3.5, 11, and 23.5. The same spread of rank positions is apparent in the case of other denominations as well.

On Table 3-B the professionalistic emphasis rank for each seminary is compared to the corresponding rank of that seminary on each of the six major variables of professional socialization. In this table the rankings of the charismatic orientation, the humanitarian-reformist orientation and intrinsic religiosity were ranked from lowness to highness. The purpose was to make the rank orders coincide with the trend or direction of the predicted change in that variable over the course of professional socialization. The rankings of seminaries by variable represent the combined scores of both first-year and third-year students for each seminary. It would be meaningless to correlate, for example, the professionalistic

TABLE 3-A

RANKING OF SEMINARIES BY PROFESSIONALISTIC EMPHASIS IN CURRICULUM

Seminary	Professionalistic Emphasis Score	Professionalistic Emphasis Rank
E-3	.381	1
DC-1	.316	2
AB-1	.286	3.5
UP-1	.286	3.5
LCA-1	.265	5
M-3	.256	6
DC-2	.233	7
UCC-1	.226	8
I-2	.224	9
I-3	.222	10
AB-3	.208	11
UP-2	.200	12.5
E-2	.200	12.5
ALC-1	.192	14
SB-2	.183	15
LCA-2	.172	16
M-2	.167	17.5
SB-1	.167	17.5
M-1	.156	19
LCA-3	.150	20
I-1	.125	21
E-1	.111	22
P-1	.104	23.5
AB-2	.104	23.5

TABLE 3-B

RANKINGS OF SEMINARIES BY PROFESSIONALISTIC EMPHASIS IN CURRICULUM AND BY PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES

	Professional		Rankings of Variables of Professional Socialization*				
Seminary	Emphasis Rank	Charis.	Human.-Rev.	Intrin.Rel.	Master of C.S.	Bureau.	Extr.Rel.
E-3	1	6	13	1	7	23	2
DC-1	2	5	12	11	15	1	11
AB-1	3.5	7	20	15	11	4	7
UP-1	3.5	20	16	12	20	24	16
LCA-1	5	4	1	5	19	16.5	12
M-3	6	19	11	19	13	10	19
DC-2	7	9	15	20	21	16.5	6
UCC-1	8	13	7	8	18	12	8
I-2	9	1	22	6	3	18	1
I-3	10	3	23	9	4	21	3
AB-3	11	21	4	22	17	2	22
UP-2	12.5	11	21	17	6	9	9
E-2	12.5	12	2	2	12	22	17
ALC-1	14	8	8	13.5	2	11	10
SB-2	15	24	3	23	22	7	24
LCA-2	16	15	9	7	8	15	15
M-2	17.5	10	17	10	14	13	14
SB-1	17.5	23	6	24	24	8	23
M-1	19	16	19	16	10	20	18
LCA-3	20	18	5	3	16	14	5
I-1	21	2	24	13.5	1	19	4
E-1	22	14	10	4	5	5	13
P-1	23.5	22	14	18	23	6	20
AB-2	23.5	17	18	21	9	3	21

*The first three variables (Charismatic, Humanitarian-Reformist, and Intrinsic Religiosity) were ranked from low to high, in keeping with the predicted directionality of change during the course of professional socialization. The other three variables were ranked high to low for the same reason.

emphasis rank with (a) the first-year students' ranking and then (b) the third-year rankings, since the very selection of the indicators themselves was based on the "equivalence" of first-year and third-year rankings for items in the particular variable.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients showing the association between professionalistic emphasis of curriculum and each of the professional socialization variables are presented in Table 3-C. Positive correlations were found to exist with four of the six variables. Mastery of Communications Skills and the Bureaucratic Orientation rankings proved to be negatively correlated with the ranking of professionalistic emphasis in curriculum, though not significantly so. Two of the correlations coefficients proved significant at the .05 level. They include the charismatic orientation (.383) and the extrinsic religiosity orientation (.353). This is to be interpreted as saying that the greater the professionalistic emphasis of the curriculum, the lesser the degree of charismatic orientation and the greater the degree of extrinsic religiosity to be found among the students in that seminary. There is, therefore, a degree of support given to Hypothesis 3. Four of the six variables of professional socialization, however, were not significantly correlated with professionalistic emphasis of curriculum. Thus it must be concluded that the hypothesis not supported.

Independent Seminaries and Denominational Seminaries

Hypothesis 4 was a prediction that there would be significant differences between independent or non-denominational seminaries and those seminaries which are formally identified with a particular denomination. More specifically, the hypothesis states that the differences would occur

TABLE 3-C

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PROFESSIONALISTIC EMPHASIS OF CURRICULUM AND THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES⁺

Variable	Correlation with Professionalistic Emphasis of Curriculum
Charismatic Orientation	.383*
Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation	.035
Intrinsic Religiosity	.200
Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation	-.100
Bureaucratic Orientation	-.203
Extrinsic Religiosity	.353*

⁺Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients
*Significant at the .05 level.

on each variable of professional socialization for both the first-year and third-year levels, with the independent seminaries showing significantly greater degrees of professional socialization than their denominational colleagues. The pertinent data for the testing of this hypothesis are given in Table 4. The differences in scores on all six variables for both first-year and third-year levels are indeed striking. All but one of the "t" scores in this table are highly significant, statistically, and reach probability levels of much less than .05.

Upon closer analysis, the picture suddenly takes a curious turn. With regard to four of the variables, the very significant differences which are observed did occur in the predicted direction. The scores in the charismatic orientation, the intrinsic religiosity orientation, the mastery of communications skills orientation and the extrinsic religiosity orientation were all significantly different, with independent seminaries showing lower scores in the former two variables and higher scores in the latter two variables--just as predicted. With respect to the humanitarian-reformist orientation, however, the differences are equally significant--but in the opposite direction. The same can be seen in regard to the scores on the bureaucratic orientation. While the independent seminarians do indeed show many evidences of greater professional socialization than their denominational colleagues, they are at the same time, significantly less bureaucratically-inclined and considerably more given to humanitarianism and reformism than their colleagues. The table reveals a high degree of consistency with respect to both the "direction" of the difference in scores and the extent of significance of these differences at both the first-year and third-year levels. The hypothesis therefore is supported, broadly speaking although not without certain

TABLE 4

DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES BETWEEN STUDENTS IN DENOMINATIONAL SEMINARIES AND STUDENTS IN INDEPENDENT SEMINARIES

VARIABLE	FIRST-YEAR SCORES			THIRD-YEAR SCORES		
	Denom. (n=985)	Indep. (n=183)	t	Denom. (n=1050)	Indep. (n=129)	t
Charismatic Orientation	.633	.292	9.22784^{++++}	.620	.325	6.72374^{++++}
Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation	.194	.355	4.28766^{++}	.206	.313	2.50627**
Intrinsic Religiosity	.239	.149	3.03815****	.200	.093	3.76830^{+}
Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation	.504	.683	4.72213^{+++}	.442	.686	5.59085^{++++}
Bureaucratic Orientation	.095	.054	2.14184*	.091	.056	1.58344
Extrinsic Religiosity	.070	.202	4.28955^{++}	.086	.192	2.96573***

*Significant at .03 level.
** Significant at .012 level.
***Significant at .004 level.
****Significant at .002 level.
$^{+}$Significant at .0002 level.
$^{++}$Significant at .00006 level.
$^{+++}$Significant at .000006 level.
$^{++++}$Significant at .0000006 level.

important qualifications.

Internal Consistency of Professional Socialization Variables

Hypothesis 5 predicted that a seminary's rank on any one variable of professional socialization would be directly and significantly related to its rank on any of the other variables. In effect, this hypothesis is aimed at determining the internal consistency of the major variables in this study. Two approaches were taken to the testing of the hypothesis.

The first approach involved the computation of Spearman Rank Correlation coefficients for each variable as it is correlated with every other variable. Table 5-A contains these intercorrelations. The correlations were based on the rankings of "lowness" in the charismatic, humanitarian-reformist and intrinsic religiosity orientations, in keeping with the predicted directions stated in the hypotheses. Therefore there should not be a negative correlation in Table 5-A, theoretically speaking. Obviously, such is not the case. The mean intercorrelation for each of the six variables ranges from +.25 to -.20, thus failing statistical significance. A close look at this table reveals that this lack of association is not of a "random" nature, but that it is due to the presence of two "maverick" variables--namely, humanitarianism-reformism and bureaucratic orientation. In the great majority of cases, both these variables are negatively correlated with the other four variables. Therefore, the four variables which correlated positively to each other were temporarily segregated in order to determine the extent to which they do correlate with each other. Table 5-B gives the mean correlation coefficients which resulted. It is interesting to note that in all four cases, the mean correlations thus obtained are significant at the less than .01 level.

TABLE 5-A

INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG THE VARIABLES OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION[1]

	Charis.	Human.-Reform.	Intrinsic Relig.	Mastery of C.S.	Bureau.	Extrinsic Relig.
Charismatic Orientation	-	-.441	.515	.615	-.342	.353
Humanitarian-Reformist	-.441	-	.098	-.518	.183	-.446
Intrinsic Religiosity	.515	.098	-	.450	-.515	.586
Mastery of Commun.Skills	.615	-.518	..450	-	-.272	.533
Bureaucratic Orientation	-.342	.183	-.515	-.272	-	-.426
Extrinsic Religiosity	.353	-.446	.586	.533	-.426	-

[1] Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients are given above. The Charismatic, Humanitarian-Reformist, and Intrinsic Religiosity scores were ranked from lowness to highness, in keeping with the predictions stated in the hypotheses. There should have been, therefore, no negative correlations in this table.

TABLE 5-B

MEAN INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE FOUR POSITIVELY CORRELATED VARIABLES OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION (BASED ON TABLE 5-A)

Variable	Mean of Correlations With Other Three Variables
Charismatic	.494*
Intrinsic Religiosity	.517*
Mastery of Communications Skills	.533*
Extrinsic Religiosity	.497*

*Significant at the .01 level.

The second approach to the problem of assessing the internal consistency of these variables involved the use of Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance (W), a technique which measures the relationship among several rankings of individuals. When "N" is larger than seven, as in this study, the formula for "W" is translatable into chi square terms through another formula offered by Siegel.[2] After making the proper computations for the six variables of professional socialization, a chi square value of 27.462 was obtained, which has a probability level of between .20 and .30, and therefore lacks significance. When the same procedures were applied to only those four variables which were found to be positively correlated, the chi square value jumped to 62.56, which is significant at considerably less than the .001 level.

Hypothesis 5, therefore, is partially supported. There is obviously good ground for questioning whether all six variables employed to measure professional socialization do in fact serve that purpose. There is good evidence, however, that four of the six variables do "hang together" as predicted, although this fact can hardly be used to justify any claim to validity.

Social Prestige of Denomination and Professional Socialization

To put hypothesis 6 to the test it was necessary to determine scores for whole denominations on each variable, and then combine them into a "professionalism score" for the denomination, which could then be ranked.

The "professionalism score" was derived in the following manner.

---

[2] Siegel, Sidney, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1956), pp. 229-236.

Each of the variables was scored separately for each denomination, using exactly the same procedures as were followed in computing the score of a seminary for a particular variable. If there were two seminaries in the denomination, for example, the scores of each seminary were not simply averaged, since one seminary might be several times larger than the other one and thus ought to carry more weight in determining the score for the whole denomination. Therefore, all the students' responses to the variable in question were totaled, just as if the score on an individual seminary was being computed. This proportion of "favorable" responses was then divided by the entire number of possible favorable responses for the entire denomination to arrive at the score for that variable. Thus the score for the denomination has a sort of "built-in" weighting system.

To facilitate matters and to maintain the intent of the predictions of the hypotheses, the "reciprocal" scores were used on the three variables which had been predicted to decrease from first to third-year--namely, the charismatic, humanitarian-reformist and the intrinsic religiosity orientations. By reciprocal score is meant, for purposes of this study, "100-x," where "x" is the score attained on one of the three variables expected to decrease throughout training. Thus, if a seminary contains a high degree of charismatic orientation--for instance, a score of 88.5--its reciprocal, or 11.5, would be the figure used in determining its professionalism score. To arrive at the final professionalism score for the denomination, then, simply required the adding up of the six variable scores (three of which are "reciprocals").

The "professionalism scores" for the ten denominations and the independent seminaries are given in Table 6-A. The table also contains

TABLE 6-A

PROFESSIONALISM SCORES OF DENOMINATIONS AND COMPOSITE PROFESSIONALISM SCORES

	Scores on Variables of Professional Socialization (Reciprocals in Parentheses)						
Denomination	Charismatic	Human.-Reform.	Intrinsic Rel.	Mast.of C.S.	Bureau.	Ext.Rel.	Final
Southern Baptist	91.57 (09.43)	14.32 (85.68)	40.03 (59.97)	45.90	10.06	0.43	35.02
Methodist	53.27 (46.73)	23.74 (76.26)	16.08 (83.92)	55.78	7.62	7.98	46.38
United Presbyterian	53.03 (46.97)	29.24 (70.76)	17.37 (82.63)	59.08	8.62	11.24	46.55
American Baptist	49.29 (50.71)	24.70 (75.30)	20.82 (79.18)	58.52	13.33	9.76	47.80
Episcopal	47.61 (52.39)	18.58 (81.42)	06.58 (93.42)	61.82	6.45	13.41	51.49
Lutheran Church in America	54.42 (45.58)	15.63 (84.37)	10.06 (89.94)	54.14	8.08	13.69	49.30
American Lutheran Church	43.00 (57.00)	17.20 (82.80)	15.40 (84.60)	68.33	9.66	12.20	52.43
Presbyterian, U.S.	73.93 (26.07)	22.92 (77.08)	18.87 (81.13)	45.88	11.23	5.61	41.17
United Church of Christ	53.07 (46.93)	15.76 (84.24)	12.30 (87.70)	49.03	8.97	12.69	48.26
Disciples of Christ	39.38 (60.62)	21.83 (78.17)	16.93 (83.07)	50.17	11.90	12.65	49.43
Independent	30.64 (69.36)	33.78 (66.22)	12.62 (87.38)	68.48	5.55	19.80	52.80
Baptists (Composite)	81.63 (18.37)	16.76 (83.24)	35.51 (64.49)	48.87	10.83	2.62	38.07
Lutherans (Composite)	50.11 (49.89)	16.22 (83.78)	12.07 (87.93)	59.49	8.67	13.13	50.48
Presbyterians (Composite)	57.94 (42.06)	27.75 (72.25)	17.73 (82.27)	55.98	9.23	9.92	45.29

"composite" denominational scores, the computation of which was simply an extension of the procedures already described for the determination of the professionalism score. The only difference is that "Lutherans," as a whole, were given a score made up of the combined scores of the three Lutheran Church in America seminaries and the one American Lutheran seminary in the sample. Likewise, a score for "Baptists" as a whole was derived from a combination of Southern Baptist and American Baptist scores; and the "Presbyterian" score was based on a combination of United Presbyterian and Presbyterian, U.S. scores. These composite denominational scores were necessary to test the hypothesis, since the "prestige rankings" of denominational groups in American society do not normally distinguish between Southern Baptists and American Baptists, or between American Lutherans and "L.C.A." Lutherans.

Table 6-B contains the rankings of the seven broad denominational categories according to (a) social prestige accorded in American society, and (b) degree of "professionalism" expressed by seminarians. From the table it can be seen that there is a certain degree of relationship between prestige and professionalism, but the resultant Spearman Correlation Coefficient is only .42, considerably short of the .71 correlation needed for significance at the .05 level. Hypothesis 6, therefore, is not supported by the evidence. The greatest discrepancies between prestige rank and professional score rank were found among the Lutherans, Disciples of Christ and the Presbyterians. The dangers of over-categorizing are evident in the data on Table 6-A. The composite "Baptist" professionalism score of 38.07, for instance, is based on the scores of two Baptist denominations which are quite significantly different from each

TABLE 6-B

RANKING OF DENOMINATIONS BY PROFESSIONALISM SCORES AND BY SOCIAL PRESTIGE IN U. S.*

Denomination	Professionalism Score	Professionalism Rank	Prestige Rank
Episcopal	.5149	1	1
Lutheran	.5048	2	5
Disciples of Christ (Christian)	.4943	3	6
United Church of Christ (Congregational)	.4826	4	2
Methodist	.4638	5	4
Presbyterian	.4529	6	3
Baptist	.3807	7	7

*The two rankings in this table, when correlated, yielded a Spearman rank correlation coefficient of .42 (not significant).

other in some ways. The American Baptists have a final score of 47.80, as compared to 35.02 for their colleagues from Southern Baptist background. The American Baptist seminarians thus demonstrate a higher degree of professionalism than both the Presbyterians and the Methodists. The most striking differences among the Baptist denomination scores are seen in columns one and three on Table 6-A, where it is evident that the American Baptists scored, roughly speaking, about half as high as did the Southern Baptists on the charismatic and the intrinsic religiosity variables. Also, the American Baptists scored substantially higher on the mastery of communications skills and extrinsic religiosity than did the Southern Baptists. The scores of the American Baptists, in fact, seem to parallel the scores of the United Presbyterians and the Methodists on all variables much more closely than they do the scores of their Baptist colleagues.

Less striking, though oftentimes substantial, differences can also be observed in the cases of the two Lutheran denominations and the two Presbyterian denominations in the sample. The American Lutheran seminarians were second only to the "Independents" in terms of degree of professionalism overall, although their colleagues from the Lutheran Church in America were not too far behind in any of the variables. Greater differences were observed between the United Presbyterians and the Presbyterian, U.S. group. The latter tended to be closer, actually, to the scores of the Southern Baptists on such variables as charismatic orientation, master of communications skills and extrinsic religiosity than they were to their Presbyterian colleagues from another denomination. The Presbyterian, U.S. seminarians showed the only denominational score which was even close to the lowest score of 35.02, assigned to the Southern Baptists.

Professionalism and Withdrawals from Training

The final hypotheses of the study had to do with the association between dropout or withdrawal rates from seminary training and (a) the professionalistic emphasis of the curriculum and (b) the degree of professional socialization expressed by the seminarians.

The official statistics on withdrawal rates for the two classes in question--that is, the group entering seminary training in 1962-63 school year, and the group entering training in the 1960-61 school year--were obtained from twenty-two of the twenty-four seminaries in the sample. One of the Disciples of Christ seminaries, however, reported that records were available only on the seminarians entering training in the 1962-63 school year. Therefore, for the "3rd year" class in this study, dropout statistics were available from only twenty-one of the seminaries. Repeated requests were mailed to the two "non-responding" seminaries (SB-2 and UP-2), but without success.

Table 7-A contains the withdrawal rates, expressed in percentages, for the reporting seminaries. It is readily apparent that the withdrawal rates of the first-year and the third-year classes for each seminary are, generally speaking, very similar. In only three cases is there a difference of more than ten percentage points between the rates of the first-year and third-year classes. This lends some support, perhaps, to the claim that the two populations of students in each seminary --the first-year and the third-year classes--are generally comparable.

The rankings of seminaries by withdrawal rates and by the professionalistic emphasis of the curriculum are presented in Table 7-B. Both the withdrawal rankings and professionalistic emphasis rankings are from

TABLE 7-A

RANKING OF SEMINARIES BY RATE OF WITHDRAWAL FROM TRAINING

Seminary	Rate of Withdrawal (1st yr.)	Rate of Withdrawal (3rd yr.)	Rank Order of Withdrawal Rate (1st yr.)	Rank Order of Withdrawal Rate (3rd yr.)
SB-1	45.6	41.5	1	1
M-1	36	14	4	14
M-2	29.2	38	6	3
M-3	29.4	29.1	5	6
UP-1	27.6	24	7	8
AB-1	15.4	9.9	15	17
AB-2	40	30	3	5
AB-3	17	35	14	4
E-1	9.7	15	19	13
E-2	15	23	16	9
E-3	18	19	12.5	11
LCA-1	11.4	15.4	17	12
LCA-2	0	0	22	21
LCA-3	18	9	12.5	18
ALC-1	10.8	6.5	18	19
P-1	22.3	25	9	7
UCC-1	8.6	2.7	20	20
DC-1[a]	5	-	21	-
DC-2	21	10	10.5	16
I-1	21	12	10.5	15
I-2	25	20	8	10
I-3	47	41	2	2

[a] Only the data from the "1st year" class was available from this seminary.

"high" to "low." The Spearman coefficient of correlation was computed to determine the degree of association between dropout rate and professionalistic emphasis of curriculum for each of the two classes--first-year and third-year. As was stated earlier, this amounts to two independent tests of the hypothesis. For the first-year class, the resultant correlation was $r_s = -.229$; and for the third-year class it was $r_s = -.081$. Neither correlation is statistically significant. The direction of the relationship between dropout rate and professional emphasis of curriculum suggests, however, that the higher dropout rates are in the seminaries with the lower degrees of professionalistic emphasis.

The relationship between each of the six variables of professional socialization and the withdrawal rates of each of the two classes in the sample is shown in Table 7-C. The first three variables--the charismatic, the humanitarian-reformist and intrinsic religiosity--were ranked from low to high . The first-year ranking on each of the six variables was correlated with the ranking of the third-year class according to dropout rates. Of the twelve correlations thus obtained, only four were significant at the .05 level. The most "significant" variable on the table is intrinsic religiosity, which shows a fairly strong negative relationship to high dropout rates. Since intrinsic religiosity was ranked low to high, these correlations are interpreted to mean that "highness" in intrinsic religiosity is associated with high dropout rates. Similarly there is evidence to indicate that "highness" in both charismatic orientation and in humanitarian-reformist orientation is associated with high dropout rates. With regard to extrinsic religiosity, there appears to be an inverse relationship between that variable and dropout rates. That is, the higher the extrinsic

TABLE 7-B

RANK ORDERS OF SEMINARIES BY WITHDRAWAL RATES AND PROFESSIONALISTIC EMPHASIS OF CURRICULUM*

Seminary	Rank of Withdrawal Rates		Rank of Professionalistic Emphasis	
	(1st yr. class)	(3rd yr. class)	(1st yr. class)	(3rd yr. class)
SB-1	1	1	15.5	14.5
M-1	4	14	17	16
M-2	6	3	15.5	14.5
M-3	5	6	6	5
UP-1	7	8	3.5	2.5
AB-1	15	17	3.5	2.5
AB-2	3	5	21.5	20.5
AB-3	14	4	11	10
E-1	19	13	20	19
E-2	16	9	12	11
E-3	12.5	11	1	1
LCA-1	17	12	5	4
LCA-2	22	21	14	13
LCA-3	12.5	18	18	17
ALC-1	18	19	13	12
P-1	9	7	21.5	20.5
UCC-1	20	20	8	7
DC-1	21	-	2	-
DC-2	10.5	16	7	6
I-1	10.5	15	19	18
I-2	8	10	9	8
I-3	2	2	10	9

*Spearman coefficient of correlation between the two "1st yr. class" ranks above was r= -.229; between the two "3rd yr. class" ranks above, it was r= -.081 . Neither correlation is statistically significant.

TABLE 7-C

RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN WITHDRAWAL RATES AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES, FOR FIRST-YEAR AND THIRD-YEAR GROUPS (BASED ON DATA FROM TABLE 3-A)

Variable	Correlation with 1st yr. Ranking	Correlation with 3rd yr. Ranking
Charismatic Orientation[a]	-.162	-.409*
Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation[a]	-.448*	-.316
Intrinsic Religiosity[a]	-.382*	-.397*
Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation	.207	-.137
Bureaucratic Orientation	-.158	.127
Extrinsic Religiosity	-.283	-.255

[a] Correlation coefficient based on the fact that this variable was ranked from "lowness" to "highness," in keeping with the hypotheses.

*Significant at the .05 level.

religiosity the lower the dropout rates tend to be, although this relationship is not statistically significant. In view of the fact that only four of the twelve correlations reach statistical significance, the null hypothesis utilized here cannot be rejected.

Hypothesis 8 assumed that the really crucial factor would not be simply the professionalistic emphasis of the seminary's curriculum nor would it be the degree of professional socialization evidenced by the seminarians. Instead, the important factor was thought to be the disparity between the two. The greater the disparity between professionalistic emphasis in curriculum and the degree of professional socialization shown by the seminarians, the greater should be withdrawal rate. Table 8-A shows the disparity between the rank of a seminary on professionalistic emphasis of curriculum and its rank on each of the six variables of professional socialization, for both the first and third-year groups. Table 8-B reveals, in effect, that disparity was not nearly as important a factor in predicting dropout rates as had been anticipated. Only three of the twelve correlations in Table 8-B attain the .05 level of significance or beyond. The disparity between charismatic orientation of the students and the professionalistic emphasis of the curriculum appeared to be fairly significant in its relationship to dropout rates. The only other disparity of any consequence was found to exist in the case of extrinsic religiosity. The disparity between that variable and the professionalistic emphasis of curriculum was clearly associated to some degree with rate of withdrawal, although only in the case of the third-year students was this correlation statistically significant. With regard to the other four variables, the evidence for the importance of disparity is simply

TABLE 8-A

RANKINGS OF "DISPARITY" BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL EMPHASIS OF CURRICULUM AND THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION VARIABLES, FOR BOTH FIRST-YEAR AND THIRD-YEAR GROUPS OF SEMINARIANS

Seminary	Charismatic (1st)	Charismatic (3rd)	Human.-Ref. (1st)	Human.-Ref. (3rd)	Intrin. Relig. (1st)	Intrin. Relig. (3rd)	Mast.of C.S. (1st)	Mast.of C.S. (3rd)	Bureaucratic (1st)	Bureaucratic (3rd)	Extrin. Relig. (1st)	Extrin. Relig. (3rd)
SB-1	11	9.5	3	15	13.5	9	13	15.5	15	6	13	10
M-1	13.5	16	20	13.5	16	15	8.5	9.5	22	17	18.5	21
M-2	22	6	15	20	12	11	20.5	19	17	11	15	11
M-3	3	3	13.5	13.5	8.5	4	18.5	6	20.5	5	3	5.5
UP-1	3	1	10	3	7	7	3	4.5	4	4	1	3
AB-1	19	9.5	2	1	13.5	2.5	11	15.5	17	20.5	17	9
AB-2	5	12	16	11	18	18	1	8	1	2	10	14.5
AB-3	6	4.5	9	16	6	5	17	12	10	9	4.5	5.5
E-1	18	4.5	11.5	2	3	1	11	2	2.5	12	4.5	8
E-2	17	17.5	13.5	9.5	5	8	22	11	11	7	21	5.5
E-3	12	14.5	4	5	20.5	21	14	9.5	2.5	1	16	19
LCA-1	15	20.5	1	7	1	2.5	18.5	17.5	8	13.5	7	2
LCA-2	20.5	20.5	20	18.5	20.5	15	15	2	7	13.5	18.5	5.5
LCA-3	16	14.5	22	8	8.5	12	7	17.5	13	20.5	11.5	17
P-1	3	19	5	12	15	13	20.5	21	5	3	14	16
UCC-1	13.5	11	17.5	21	10	19.5	5	14	13	19	11.5	19
DC-1	7	-	11.5	0	2	-	4	-	20.5	-	9	-
DC-2	20.5	17.5	20	9.5	4	6	6	4.5	6	18	21	19
I-1	9	7.5	6.5	5	20.5	19.5	16	13	9	9	7	13
I-2	9	7.5	6.5	5	17	15	8.5	20	13	9	7	12
I-3	1	2	17.5	18.5	11	10	2	2	17	15.5	2	1

TABLE 8-B

RANK CORRELATIONS COEFFICIENTS OF "DISPARITY" (FROM TABLE 7-A) AND WITHDRAWAL RATES FROM TRAINING, BY VARIABLE AND BY YEAR OF SEMINARY TRAINING

Variable	First-Year Students	Third-Year Students
Charismatic Orientation	.347	.460*
Humanitarian-Reformist Orientation	-.045	-.142
Intrinsic Religiosity	-.221	.241
Mastery of Communications Skills Orientation	.137	-.105
Bureaucratic Orientation	-.125	.612*
Extrinsic Religiosity	.238	.391**

*Significant at the .01 level.
**Significant at the .05 level.

non-existent. In fact, the disparity between humanitarian-reformist orientation and professionalistic emphasis of curriculum is inversely related to dropout rates. Hypothesis 8, therefore, is definitely not supported by the evidence.

Summary of the Findings

Since this chapter contained an extensive body of statistical data, a summary of the findings would seem to be in order. Generally speaking, there was little support for the predicted relationship between length of training and degree of professional socialization. The predicted differences between first-year and third-year seminarians were observed on only three of the six variables of professional socialization, and almost none of these differences was statistically significant. In the case of two of the variables of professional socialization, the differences in first-year and third-year scores were in a direction opposite to that which was predicted. The differences between denominations were far more striking than differences between first-year and third-year students.

Sons of clergymen did not show an appreciably higher degree of professional socialization than did their colleagues in denominational seminaries. Sons of clergymen did score higher on three of the variables of professional socialization, but on the other three variables their scores were hardly different from those of other seminarians. The professionalistic emphasis of the seminary curriculum was found to be directly related to four of the six professional socialization variables, though it was correlated significantly with only two of these variables. Professionalistic emphasis of curriculum was found to be not significantly related to withdrawal rates of seminaries. Rate of withdrawal from seminary training was significantly related to only one of the six variables of professional socialization. The disparity between professionalistic emphasis of curriculum and the level of professional socialization of students was not significantly related to withdrawal rates.

The prediction that independent seminarians would show a greater degree of professional socialization than would their colleagues from denominational seminaries received substantial support from the data. The differences between these two groups were highly significant on all six of the professional socialization variables. Interestingly, however, the observed differences on two of these variables were in the opposite direction from that predicted in the hypothesis. The social prestige of the denomination was only slightly correlated with the degree of professional socialization exhibited by its seminarians. The six variables of professional socialization lacked any significant degree of internal consistency. Four of these variables were significantly intercorrelated, but they were negatively correlated with the other two variables.

The problem of interpreting these findings more fully will be the task of Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

AN INTERPRETATIVE SUMMARY

It is perhaps typical of researchers to cherish overly optimistic expectations concerning the fate of their painstakingly formulated hypotheses. If convincing support from the data is absent, it becomes incumbent upon the researcher to retrace his footsteps, trying to discover at what point they went astray. The number of possible points is considerable. Perhaps the linkages between the relevant body of theory and his own hypotheses were poorly forged. A flaw at any point in the process of data collection, measurement of variables or the analysis of data could easily produce a distorted picture of whatever "reality" the researcher was investigating.

The findings of the present study, as presented in Chapter III, indicate little or no significant support for the great majority of the hypotheses. It remains, therefore, to consider why the hypotheses were so largely unsupported, and to examine possible alternative explanations which might account for the findings. In so doing, future research into problems similar to that of the present study may avoid some of the pitfalls to which this study was vulnerable. It is a possibility, of course, that the findings do represent an approximate picture of reality--that the clergy, in other words, are a profession which has somehow managed to stand aloof from the worldly trends affecting less exalted callings. In spite of the lack of convincing evidence for the hypotheses, however, this writer is not yet prepared to accept that alternative.

To begin with, difficulties may have originated in the data source utilized for this study. The use of secondary data for purposes distinctly different from the original ends for which they were collected must be considered, to some degree at least, an initial disadvantage. Certainly, the task of finding the most feasible type of pre-seminary education for seminarians (the goal of the original research project) is considerably different from that of the present study. This was not considered to be any insurmountable obstacle, since the scope of the Culver-Bridston questionnaire ranged far beyond the kinds of questions necessary to the immediate purposes of their study.

One of the main weaknesses in using the Culver-Bridston data for purposes of the present study became apparent, however, when the actual indicators of the major variables of professional socialization were to be selected. The number of items from the questionnaire possessing "logical" validity as indicators of the major variables was sufficiently large. The means by which the indicators were finally chosen, however, quickly reduced the list substantially, since only those items were selected which proved to be internally consistent with one another.

Objection might, perhaps, be made to the assumption that first-year students are comparable in every relevant respect to the third-year students in each seminary, the only significant difference being that the first-year group is lacking two years of professional training. This assumption, which received some support from comparative dropout statistics on the two groups, cannot, of course, be proven. To increase the likelihood of comparability of the two populations, entire groups of degree-seeking students at first and third-year levels were chosen from each seminary. The alternative--that is, selecting a random sample from each seminary--was seen as involving more risk to comparability. In addition, those seminaries which had the highest response rate to the Culver-Bridston questionnaire were selected to represent their denomination. This measure was taken to strengthen the claim for comparability.

The issue regarding comparability of the first-year and third-year groups is, of course, immediately related to the objection that this study was a cross-sectional rather than a longitudinal one. Since the questionnaire was administered only once--during the 1962-63 school year --it was not possible to use a longitudinal design, despite obvious advantages over the cross-sectional design. Had a longitudinal design been possible, a much more valid "before-after" picture could have emerged, by following up individual students in each seminary, comparing their scores at two or more stages of their training. The cross-sectional design makes this study, by necessity, highly inferential. It is entirely possible that a longitudinal design might have yielded findings quite different from those described in Chapter III of the present study. On the other hand, it is hard to have much confidence in this factor as a source of the failure to find support for the hypotheses. Scores, if not hundreds, of sociological studies share this same characteristic, yet have found support for hypotheses.

The fact that the present study is, in many respects, an exploratory study was mentioned earlier in this paper. One indication of this is the use of the term "orientation" for each of the major variables measured in this study. "Orientation" was a term of last resort, representing the only term deemed suitable for denoting something which could not readily be categorized under such more familiar and specific captions as "value," "attitude" or "self-concept." Many of the items chosen as indicators of variables seemed to elicit only general "inclinations" or "tendencies" which only the term "orientation" seemed adequate to describe. The use of this term, admittedly an extremely imprecise word, does not render the study totally outside the realm of acceptable research procedures. It does mean, however, that there must be some pioneering efforts, not only to define what one means by a specific orientation, but to do so in terms which are amenable to empirical testing. Such a definition should also, hopefully, possess at least some degree of generalizability or applicability so that the orientations thus defined carry something more than a merely *ad hoc* meaning.

A fundamental question which confronts the present study--and for that matter, most sociological studies--has to do with the locating of causes for certain observed effects. There is no researcher so astute as to be able to personally observe all of the forces which exert an influence on the thinking and behavior of even a single individual. Therefore any study purporting to discover "the" causes for apparent changes in values or behavior over a period of time is in deep water from the start. Even assuming that the apparent changes have been accurately observed, and do, in fact, represent genuine changes of the type described, the basic question still remains: what other factors might have acted to produce "x" effect? The present study has concentrated on the influence of a rather abstract notion labeled "professional socialization." It is certainly conceivable, however, that many other factors might combine to produce a series of effects mistakenly credited to the sole influence of professional socialization.

A psychologist might object, for example, that this study has not considered the effect of simple maturation on changes in values or thought patterns. Even remaining within the domain of the sociocultural, however, there could be a variety of factors contributing to a particular kind of observed outcome. Important changes in status and role requirements, such as those occasioned by marriage and parenthood, could initiate some rather "global" shifts in thinking and behaving. In the present study, for example, it is quite likely that the third-year students, as a group, have a higher proportion of both husbands and fathers than would be found in the first-year group. Such differences, seemingly inconsequential, may actually be quite significant in accounting for changes normally attributed to other causes. Condemnations such as this can easily be directed at professional socialization studies in general. Admittedly, some of these factors can be identified and controlled in the research design, more so than was the case in this study.

Another possible consideration is the general effect of the educational process itself, particularly at the college level. Away from parental control, possibly for the first time, and exposed to a wide variety of opinion on an even wider range of subject matter, the college student might be expected to undergo some rather radical shifts in values and behavior. What evidence is available on this question seems to suggest a sort of "liberalizing" effect occurring among undergraduates, though significant changes seem the exception rather than the rule. More significant than the differences between freshmen and seniors are the differences between freshmen in church-related college "X" and freshmen in state university "Y."

Studies of students at the graduate level, however, do tend to reveal some rather striking changes in the students' aspirations, values and self-conceptions. Such evidence lends credence to the notion that there is a type of socialization process occurring among professionals-in-training--a process which contains characteristic elements common to all professions. The many restrictions of the present research design--as, for example, the necessity of relying upon a cross-sectional design--would render pretentious any claims to precise measurement. From the beginning of the present study, what was hoped for was the discovery of some clue that professional socialization might be occurring among Protestant seminary students, in certain predicted directions, so that future studies might proceed on somewhat surer footing.

In assessing the results of this research, a review of the theory and research lying behind it is also indicated. Adult socialization theory strongly suggests the probability that a period of intensive, directed training of a group of persons who are highly motivated to be trained, conducted in a setting relatively isolated from outside influences, ought to result in certain changes in those persons, and in the directions desired by those in charge of the training process. The first chapter of this study contained a survey of studies on the socialization of various kinds of professionals-in-training. These studies seem to concur on the point that (a) changes in neophytes do occur during the training period--sometimes on a rather sweeping scale, and (b) the nature of such changes tends to follow a common pattern--that is, a shift away from the broad societal goals which characterized the initial motivations of perhaps the large majority of professionals in the direction of a mastery of proficiency in the work tasks of that profession.

The descriptions of these shifts, however, raise a very basic question. Given that the researcher finds clear empirical evidence suggesting a definite shift in orientation during professional training, how lasting or permanent can this change be assumed to be? The shift from altruism, a "lay conception of the professional role," to "cynicism" in medical students was observed to be only a temporary sort of shift. As the termination of professional training neared, a new idealism emerged. It was new in the sense that it had a professional dimension to it, but it was idealism nonetheless. Perhaps the same might be true of seminary students. If this study had examined the responses of second-year students as well as the other two classes of students, perhaps some light might have been shed on this possibility. Second-year students, conceivably, might be the ones most characterized by a shift away from altruistic motivations toward a mastery of skills orientation. Perhaps as the end of professional training approached, as was the case with the medical students, a new form of altruism or humanitarianism arose--albeit a more "professionalized" brand of altruism.

Other evidence from the study of medical students suggests that the period in which the greatest professional socialization occurs is in the year of internship, when the young doctor is thoroughly exposed to on-the-job conditions. Perhaps at this point he suddenly is made aware of the need for a thorough mastery of basic work tasks, and the value of a "professional" attitude toward clients and fellow practitioners. The same might be true of the seminarian. The seminarian, working under the supervision of an experienced professional in a real "live" church situation, may for the first time become fully aware of his professional status and role obligations. Consequently, it might not be until that stage of his career that he undergoes any significant shift in the directions predicted in the hypotheses, even though the groundwork for the change was laid during seminary training. Or perhaps the shift does not occur until some later time, after the apprentice minister finds himself in full charge of a particular congregation. In other words, these predicted shifts may represent only a kind of "end product" characterizing the thinking of veteran ministers, a product which was many years in the making.

The time span during which the predicted changes were to have occurred in this study consisted of a two-year period. Is there any reason to suppose that any significant changes can take place in professional trainees in such a short period of time? Apparently so, judging from the studies of medical students, nurses and social workers. All of these were observed to have shifted away from the initial altruistic motivations toward the mastery of work skills orientation very markedly within that space of time. In the case of nursing students, however, the evidence indicated that they became more bureaucratically inclined after employment was obtained--not during the course of their training. The nurses became quickly attached to the particular hospital setting in which they found employment, and showed great loyalty and pride in their hospital. It is interesting to note, however, that as this bureaucratic loyalty increased, the professional orientation of the nurses did not diminish. Perhaps this is also true of the seminary students. It may well be that in the process in which the altruistic concerns of the seminarian come into contact with the seemingly more immediate demands of a mastery of skills orientation, the concerns which would constitute a "bureaucratic" orientation would be pushed aside. Actually, the fact that most first-year seminarians are probably not overly enthused about the administrative and promotional concerns of a particular denomination would make such a "pushing aside" of bureaucratic interests a rather effortless task.

Perhaps, as with the nurses, the seminarian acquires no really bureaucratic concerns until his year of internship, when he becomes a part of an ongoing operation of a specific church organization. Perhaps such concerns do not come until still later, when he assumes chief administrative responsibility for a congregation. Suddenly he is being "graded" again on how successfully he competes with other new ministers. This time the grading is not being done by his seminary professors, but rather by the church hierarchy. He is now being graded on things relating to the stability, growth and general welfare of the local religious organization as it contributes to the denomination as a whole. In other words, the criteria which "matter" at this stage of his career include such things as growth of his congregation's membership, the degree of participation of his church members, the ability of his congregation to operate "in the black," his congregation's ability to assume its share of the various needs of the denomination and the public relations role played by the clergyman in his community on behalf of his denomination. The criteria on which he was formerly graded in seminary training--things like preaching with the proper inflections and intonations from a carefully-planned outline, or the application of the proper psychotherapeutic technique to the solution of a particular kind of emotional problem--have thus given way to much more "bureaucratic" factors. The studies by Blizzard, described in the first chapter, indicated that in terms of actual time spent in the typical working day of the minister, administrative and organization duties comprised almost half of the work day--more time than was spent on any other ministerial duty. It may well be, therefore, that what has been called the "bureaucratic orientation"--an obviously unpopular orientation among both first and third-year seminarians in all denominations--is the kind of concern which develops much later in the career cycle of the clergyman.

Another major orientation measured in the present study was termed the "charismatic," deriving from Weber's definition of the term, which referred to any type of personality which somehow transcends the rational-legal role definition. For purposes of the present study, the charismatic orientation consisted of the belief that the clergyman ought to be "divinely called" to his profession. It was pointed out earlier that evidence from other studies revealed that the vast majority of seminarians named the "call" as one of their three chief motivations for entering upon seminary training. Evidence from the present study indicates that whatever popularity the "calling" idea enjoyed among first-year seminarians, there was little or no evidence that its popularity was any lower among third-year students. Half of the seminaries in the sample showed an increase in charismatic orientation from first to third year; the other half showed a decrease in this orientation. On the denominational level, similarly, half of the denominations showed an increase and half a decrease from first to third year. Whatever pressures might exist in the professionalizing process toward a more rational-legal role definition, the present study found nothing to indicate any change, either way, in the degree to which Protestant seminarians conceive of the importance of "the calling." It is interesting, though, how very different the charismatic orientation scores in the various denominations actually were, at both the first-year and third-year levels. What stands out, then, is not the degree of change from first to third years but the nature and persistence of denominational differences.

The variable labeled "humanitarianism-reformism" was found to be more pronounced among third-year students than among first-year ones. Fourteen of twenty-four seminaries showed higher scores on this orientation among their third-year students. Six of ten denominations showed the same kind of difference in scores. Obviously, this orientation which some researchers have called "altruism" does not diminish during seminary training. One possible explanation is that humanitarianism-reformism may exist quite independently of the various other orientations making up "professional socialization." One's values concerning service to his fellow men or the re-making of the world through social action may possibly be quite unaffected by the whole process of professional training. It is not entirely inconceivable, in fact, that the mastery of professional skills might actually intensify or stimulate humanitarian motives. The requisite skills may be viewed by the seminarian as the avenue by which his original humanitarian sentiments may be realized in a workable fashion. An actionist emphasis, perhaps, is a natural accompaniment to a skills orientation. At least there would not seem to be any necessary contradiction implied in the coexistence of these two orientations.

Perhaps the most plausible explanation for the findings of the present study, however, is that humanitarianism-reformism represents a multi-faceted phenomenon which is not amenable to the kind of empirical testing attempted here. Perhaps it was logically erroneous to combine into one orientation two phenomena--humanitarianism and reformism--whose interrelatedness is not really known. One might have, for example, strong humanitarian sentiments which consist of a sort of amorphous and global "brotherly love." Such an individual, however, may be quite indifferent to, or even opposed to, social reform movements designed to attack specific local problems through social action. The reformist, on the other hand, may or may not be motivated by true "humanitarian" interests. He may be motivated by much less lofty aims, perhaps involving the protection of certain vested interests, the promotion of his own political ambitions or simply the need to become "involved" in a cause. Since any of these possibilities regarding the nature of humanitarianism-reformism could be true, it is little wonder, in retrospect, that the findings in this study were considerably less than significant. The theoretical refinements on this variable have yet to be sufficiently well developed to permit empirical measurement. The possibility that this variable consists of at least two distinct and perhaps competing elements may mean that in the present study, for example, humanitarianism may have diminished as predicted through seminary training, accompanied by a corresponding increase in reformism. The net effect would, of course, show up as "no significant difference" between first year and third year.

Intrinsic religiosity proved to be the orientation which most closely followed expectations. Twenty-one of the twenty-four seminaries in the sample showed a decline in this orientation, as did nine of the ten denominations in the study. As was the case with the charismatic orientation, however, the intrinsic religiosity scores were notable not so much in the degree of difference between first-year and third-year students as in the differences between denominations at both first and third-year levels.

Also following the prediction of the hypothesis were the scores on the mastery of communications skills orientation. Of the twenty-four seminaries, eighteen showed higher scores among their third-year students. The same difference was noted among eight of the ten denominations. The rate of response to the items making up the mastery of communications skills orientation was relatively high in all seminaries and at all levels of training. The relationship between the humanitarianism-reformism orientation and the mastery of skills orientation was discussed earlier in this chapter as being possibly a direct rather than inverse relationship. This point receives some support from the data, in that nineteen of the twenty-four seminaries showing differences between first and third-year students on both these variables also indicate changes in the same direction on both variables. In other words, nineteen seminaries which showed higher scores for third-year students on the one variable also showed higher scores for their third-year students on the other variable; or conversely, if the first-year students scored higher than the third-year ones on the one variable, they also scored higher on the other variable.

Only a slight trend toward greater extrinsic religiosity from first to third year was found. Thirteen of the twenty-four seminaries indicated such a trend, as did eight of the ten denominations. The items making up the extrinsic religiosity orientation were, like the bureaucratic orientation, highly unpopular responses in all denominations and at both first and third-year levels. It seems clear that the two types of religiosity identified in this study--intrinsic and extrinsic--do not exhaust the possibilities in describing the nature of religiosity. Intrinsic religiosity responses, though more popular than extrinsic religiosity responses, were in the minority in all seminaries at both first-year and third-year levels. Apparently the seminarians held religious positions which could not readily be classified into either of the two categories. The correlation between extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity is negative, and significant at the less than .01 level. This suggests that, although there may well be a better way of conceptualizing a general dichotomy of religiosity, at least these two orientations are in fact on "opposite sides of the fence" consistently. Perhaps extrinsic religiosity is, after all, a sort of variant of the broader term "bureaucratic orientation," which also proved to be an unpopular orientation in every seminary. Perhaps the stress on extrinsic religiosity, as might be the case with the bureaucratic orientation, develops later in the career pattern of the seminarian.

The hunch that sons of ministers represent a group which is, in a sense, already quite far along the road to professional socialization because of their childhood socialization, was not entirely unfounded. The samples of sons of clergymen were perhaps too small in the present study to allow for any generalizations, even at the denominational level of comparison. There is some reason to suspect, however, that such a prediction might be substantiated. At the first-year level, for example, six of the nine denominational groupings analyzed showed lower scores for the sons of clergymen on the charismatic orientation; at the third-year level, the same observation held true for seven of the nine denominations.

The scores on the humanitarianism-reformism variable showed no consistent differences between sons of clergy and all other students. The scores on intrinsic religiosity were lower for sons of clergy in six of the nine denominations at the third-year level, and in seven of the nine denominations at the first-year level, two of the differences being statistically significant. The mastery of communications skills orientation was found to be no more or less pronounced among sons of clergymen than among all other students. The two groups also showed no significant differences on the bureaucratic orientation. On the extrinsic religiosity orientation the ministers' sons scored higher than other students in five of the nine denominations in the first year of training, and in six of the nine denominations at the third year of training.

The scores for the sons of clergymen, in summary, as compared to the scores of all other seminarians, were in the predicted direction on three of the six variables. On the other three variables the differences were almost non-existent. Thus if there is any trend indicated at all, it is in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. This hypothesis assumed that the variables named as being indicators of professional socialization do in fact "hang together." It was found, however, that two of the variables--bureaucratic orientation and the humanitarian-reformist orientation--most assuredly do not seem to "belong" with the other four variables. Considering only the four variables which do seem to correlate strongly with each other, it is noteworthy that the predicted differences between sons of clergy vs. other students do occur in three of the four variables. The hypothesis, in other words, is hardly given resounding support by the data, but the findings seem to suggest a very real possibility of such a difference.

Of the six variables of professional socialization, two were significantly related to the professionalistic emphasis of a seminary's curriculum. The greater the professionalistic emphasis of the curriculum, the lesser the charismatic orientation and the greater the extrinsic religiosity. Curricular emphasis is, of course, only one of many possible influences exerted by a particular seminary which would influence the shifts in orientations predicted in this study. And the title and description of a course, needless to say, may or may not coincide closely with the content or the emphasis of a course. And the course could change in content and emphasis from one year to the next, depending on the individual professor in charge of it. Despite these shortcomings, the required professionalistic courses in the curriculum of a seminary were judged to be the most readily accessible empirical "handle" which could be grasped under the circumstances. Various other possible criteria of professional influence of the seminary were given some consideration prior to the study--factors such as age of seminary and size of its enrollment. These factors were discarded _a priori_ since there seemed nothing inherently professionalistic about the number of years a school has been operating, nor how many students it happened to have enrolled. This is not to say, obviously, that other criteria of professional emphasis of the seminary do not exist. Indeed, the full exploration of this emphasis could well be a dissertation topic in itself. But the most feasible indicator of such an emphasis, for the immediate purposes of this study, seemed to be the number of semester credits required of all B.D. students in courses with a predominantly professionalistic emphasis, in proportion to the total credits required for that degree.

While the nature of the curriculum in the individual seminary was thought to bear some relationship to the level of professional socialization exhibited by its seminarians, there was still another characteristic of the seminary which was also expected to show some correlation to the professional socialization of its students. That characteristic is the denominational affiliation or "independent" status of the seminary. The hypothesis predicted that the students in independent seminaries would show significantly greater degrees of professional socialization at both first-year and third-year levels than would their colleagues in denominationally-affiliated seminaries. This hypothesis was more strongly supported than any of the others. The predicted differences were found to exist in four of the six variables of professional socialization, and to statistically significant degrees. Again, the two exceptions were the humanitarianism-reformism orientation and the bureaucratic orientation. The independents were higher in humanitarian-reformism and lower on the bureaucratic orientation.

As a possible explanation for the higher humanitarianist-reformist scores by the independents, perhaps the factor of student selection would account for a good deal of the observed differences. The independent seminaries, carrying more prestige than other seminaries, are undoubtedly more selective, attracting a more urbane, sophisticated group of students than other seminaries. "Independent" seminarians are perhaps more likely to take a "naturalistic" view toward the problems of the community and the world than would other students. Because their parents are more likely to have held positions of community power and influence and to be involved in voluntary associations on both local and national levels, the independent seminarians are perhaps more aware of the power structure, and the interplay of interest groups which can be so instrumental in planned social change programs. The denominational seminarians, coming from less sophisticated backgrounds, perhaps lack the knowledge of complex community politics and tend to see things in "black and white" terms--black representing the "unregenerate" and white the "saved" elements of the populace. The independents might tend to see in the role of clergyman the obligation to bring his influence to bear on these societal problems. Thus the greater emphasis such students would place on humanitarian-reformist motivations.

As for the lower bureaucratic scores for the independents, this may be due to the fact that these students are not as likely to be formally affiliated with a specific denomination, and are therefore not as likely to stress the value of organizational loyalty and promotion--at least, not until they do become affiliated with a particular denomination later.

Socialization and selection, it has been argued, can partially substitute for each other. With respect to the many observed differences in scores between the independents and the denominational seminarians, it is probably correct to state that most of these differences are traceable to differences in the selection process, rather than being the effect of an effort to socialize the incoming students. It is possible that the greatest changes take place in the least selective seminaries. The matter of assessing standards of selection was, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this study. Therefore the relative importance of selection as opposed to professional socialization could not be determined.

Comparing denominations on the degree of professional socialization shown by their seminarians, it was predicted that the general prestige enjoyed by a denomination will be directly related to the professional socialization of its seminary students. The findings of this study give only a moderate--and not statistically significant--support to this prediction. Seminarians in the Lutheran and the Disciples of Christ denominations showed much higher levels of professional socialization than the prestige level of their denomination would seem to warrant. It might happen, of course, that if all the seminaries of every denomination had been analyzed, rather than a sample of them, a somewhat different rank order of professional socialization might have emerged. Or it might also be that the Lutherans and the Disciples of Christ represent denominations which are "social climbers"--eagerly seeking higher social prestige--and therefore stress professionalism in seminary training. Only the Disciple of Christ seminaries, however, show a consistently high level of professional emphasis.

The variations in scores within broad denominational groupings are often striking. American Baptists, for example, are dissimilar to Southern Baptists in many respects, nor is there a great deal of similarity between the two Presbyterian denominations in the sample. The findings therefore offer little support for the oft-stated assertion that denominational differences are a thing of the past.

The final questions dealt with in this study concerned the relationship between withdrawal or dropout rates and (a) the variables of professional socialization, and (b) the professional emphasis of the seminary. In general, the professional emphasis of the curriculum was somewhat negatively correlated with the rate of withdrawals. This indicates, perhaps, that the "reality shock" experienced by supposedly "idealistic" first-year students apparently was not overly traumatic, since it did not result in any large-scale exit from training. Perhaps the "reality shock" can actually serve as a stimulating challenge to the seminarian.

Correlating dropout rates with the variables of professional socialization, it was found that high dropout rates are directly related to high rates of intrinsic religiosity and charismatic orientation, and with low rates of extrinsic religiosity. The concern of this analysis, of course, is with correlations of group characteristics, not with the characteristics of the individual dropouts themselves. It is suggested from the findings, in other words, that withdrawal rates do possess some relationship to the degree to which a group can be described as possessing some characteristic, such as charismatic orientation. It is not possible to determine from this, however, whether the dropouts themselves are more or less charismatic than their "persisting" colleagues.

The "disparity" factor, which was predicted to be highly significant in its correlation with withdrawal rates, turned out to be relatively unimportant. The disparity between the charismatic rank of a seminary and the rank of its professionalistic emphasis, and the disparity between its extrinsic religiosity rank and its professionalistic emphasis in curriculum proved to be significantly correlated with withdrawal rates. In general, however, the "disparity" factor proved no better a predictor of dropout rates than did either professional emphasis of curriculum or the levels of professional socialization considered separately.

Did the six variables of professional socialization really measure aspects of professional socialization? If so, there should exist a high level of internal consistency among them. It was found that two of the six variables did not seem to fit well with the other four. It has been pointed out repeatedly in this study that the humanitarianism-reformism orientation and the bureaucratic orientation were, generally speaking, "mavericks" which were as often negatively correlated with the other variables as they were positively correlated. There is good reason to believe, however, that the charismatic orientation, the mastery of skills orientation, intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity do in fact represent various aspects of the same basic process--namely, professional socialization. The degree of intercorrelation among these four variables turned out to be highly significant, statistically. This degree of correlation does not, of course, validate any of the variables as being true indicators of professional socialization, but it does serve to fortify the "circumstantial evidence" for such a claim.

A broad overview of the study should include a discussion of (a) what the researcher would do differently if he were to do his study over again, and (b) what directions future research in the area might profitably undertake. If the writer were to begin again the study of the professional socialization of seminarians, using the Culver-Bridston data, there would be at least four changes in the research design.

First, the sample would be made to include not only the first-year and third-year students in the selected seminaries, but the second-year students as well. The chief reason for including them would be to determine the existence of trends in the predicted changes from first to last year. Scores of second-year students would be expected to fall somewhere between those of the other two groups. There is always the possibility, of course, of a curvilinear relationship between length of training and degree of professional socialization, in which case the second-year men would show unexpectedly high or low scores on one or more of the variables of socialization. The discovery of curvilinear relationships in a significant number of seminaries on one or more variables of professional socialization would, needless to say, open up new theoretical vistas.

Secondly, the sample should probably have included a few seminaries which possess "independent" status, but which do not maintain university affiliation or carry a prestigious, avant-garde reputation. Not every independent seminary, in other words, can be assumed _a priori_ to contain a highly sophisticated student body or an intellectualized atmosphere. The inclusion of a few lesser-known independent seminaries would have provided the basis for a comparison of independent seminarians. If, under these conditions, the independent seminarians continued to stand distinctly apart from seminarians in denominational schools, in terms of their scores, there would be increased support for the assertion that "independent" status of a seminary is a crucial factor in predicting the professional socialization of its students. But if the scores of the revised sample of independent seminarians were found to differ little from those of denominational seminarians, one could infer that perhaps other factors--as, for example, university affiliation--are more significant than independent status.

Third, comparability of groups within each seminary could undoubtedly have been strengthened by controlling for not only sex and "degree-seeking" intentions--as was done in this study--but also for such potentially important factors as age and marital status. Controlling for all of these factors would have reduced the size of the sample within each seminary, of course, but greater comparability of the populations would have been realized. And in a study which infers changes from the differences in scores between two groups, comparability is highly important.

Fourth, the selection of indicators of the variables of socialization would probably have benefited from a larger sample of seminaries. This would not necessarily mean an increase in the number of seminaries chosen for complete analysis. It would mean that in the process of selecting the indicators of the major variables, the rank order correlations for each potential indicator would be based on the rankings of, say, 36 seminaries rather than 24. Included would be seminaries representing "minor" denominations not included in the study. Such a procedure might have resulted in a number of changes in the items finally chosen as indicators. In any event, the researcher could have somewhat greater confidence in the applicability of the indicators to future studies of denominations not included in the present study.

Future studies on similar kinds of research problems could readily benefit from the shortcomings of this study. The first recommendation would be the use of a longitudinal design, which permits following individual seminarians through their professional training. Ideally, the design should also allow for follow-up studies of these same individuals at later stages in their careers. The advantages inherent in such a design should not require much elaboration. A much more accurate before-after picture of the seminarian would probably emerge, and the problem of assessing the statistical significance of changes would be greatly facilitated. A follow-up study of a sample of seminarians some years after their graduation would be instructive. Such a study would reveal, for example, the extent to which changes observed during seminary training continued to persist at a later period in the minister's career. It could also reveal that some of the changes which were predicted to occur during seminary training actually occur at some later point in the career.

A second recommendation would concern the method of data collection. Questionnaires may be the most suitable means of data collection in cases where the most perfunctory, short-answer kind of information is being sought. Where value-orientations are being investigated, however, complete reliance on the questionnaire method is perhaps dubious. If such a method is utilized at all, it should be supplemented by interviews and personal observation. Perhaps a pilot study in which seminarians are questioned about not only their present values, but also their perception of their own ideological shifts and those of their peers, would be useful. This information, obtained through rather loosely-structured interviews, could be invaluable--perhaps not so much for the testing of hypotheses as for generating them. Such a procedure could lead to improvements in the whole conceptualization of the design.

The present study utilized the concept of "professionalistic emphasis" of a seminary, using the proportion of required professionalistic courses in the seminary as the criterion of this emphasis. A better estimate of professionalistic emphasis might be obtained by interviewing top administrative officials of each seminary, as well as the persons actually charged with the responsibility of selecting the incoming students. A skillfully conceived interview schedule might be able to elicit considerable information about the professionalistic emphasis of the seminary by discovering what type of student the school wants to recruit, and what type of graduate it hopes to turn out.

This overview of the study concludes with the observation that in spite of the apparent lack of convincing support for the hypotheses, and the numerous methodological shortcomings of the analysis, there seem to be sufficient indications from the data that further investigation into the problem of professional socialization of seminarians should prove fruitful. If the present study has accomplished no more than cutting a rough path into a relatively unexplored terrain, then it has made a contribution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allport, Gordon. Religion in the Developing Personality. New York: New York University Press, 1960.

Arensberg, Conrad M. The Irish Countryman. Magnolia, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1937.

Arensberg, Conrad and Kimball, S. T. Family and Community in Ireland. Magnolia, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1959.

Bendix, Reinhard. Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait. New York: Doubleday, 1960.

Burke, Kenneth. Permanence and Change. Los Altos, Calif.: Hermes Publications, 1954.

Clark, S. D. Church and Sect in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948.

Demerath, N. J. III. Social Class in American Protestantism. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965.

Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton and Co., 1950.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Feifel, Herman (ed.). The Meaning of Death. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

Felton, Ralph. New Ministers. Madison, N. J.: Drew Theological Seminary, 1949.

Festinger, Leon and Katz, D. (eds.). Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. Dryden, New York: Dryden, 1953.

Fichter, Joseph. Religion as an Occupation. South Bend, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press, 1961.

Fichter, Joseph. Social Relations in an Urban Parish. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Francis, Roy G. and Stone, Robert. Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Frankl, Viktor. *Man's Search for Meaning*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Hughes, Everett. *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

Iscoe, Ira and Stevenson, Harold (eds.). *Personality Development in Children*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1960.

Johnson, Robert (ed.). *The Changing Church and the Changing Ministry*. Philadelphia: United Presbyterian Church, 1961.

Kallen, Horace. *Patterns of Progress*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Lenski, Gerhard. *The Religious Factor*. New York: Anchor Books, 1963.

McCormick, T. C. and Francis, Roy. *Methods of Research in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.

Merton, Robert, Reader, G., and Kendall, Patricia. *The Student Physician*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Michels, Robert. *Political Parties*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949.

Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar*. New York: Oxford Press, 1951.

Moberg, David O. *The Church as a Social Institution*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*. New York: Harper, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard and Williams, D. D. (eds.). *The Ministry in Historical Perspective*. New York: Harper, 1956.

O'Dea, Thomas. *The Mormons*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Pope, Liston. *Millhands and Preachers*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1942.

Roucek, Joseph (ed.). *Contemporary Sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958.

Schneider, Herbert. *Religion in 20th Century America*. Cambridge, Mass,: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Selltiz, Claire, Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart. *Research Methods in Social Relations*. New York: Holt, 1959.

Shaw, George Bernard. *The Doctor's Dilemma*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965. (Original copyright, 1913)

Simon, H. A. Administrative Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Sklare, Marshall (ed.). The Jews. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.

Smith, G. Milton. A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Stein, Maurice, Vidich, Arthur, and White, David (eds.). Identity and Anxiety. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.

Strauss, Anselm. Mirrors and Masks. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959.

Troeltsch, Ernest. The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. Vol. I. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Vernon, Glenn. Sociology of Religion. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Waggoner, Walter. Bachelor of Divinity. New York: Association Press, 1963.

Whyte, William, Jr. The Organization Man. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1956.

Wilensky, Harold and Lebeaux, Charles. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Articles

Becker, Howard S. "Notes on the Concept of Commitment," American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, No. 4 (July, 1960), 32-40.

Becker, Howard and Geer, Blanche. "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, XXIII, No. 1 (February, 1958), 50-56.

Becker, Howard and Casper, J. W. "Development of Identification Within an Occupation," American Journal of Sociology, LXI, No. 4 (January, 1956), 289-298.

Berger, Peter. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," Social Research, XXI (Winter, 1954), 467-485.

Bloom, Samuel. "The Process of Becoming a Physician," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXLVI (March, 1963), 77-87.

Corwin, Ronald. "The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles," American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, No. 6 (May, 1961), 604-615.

Gustafson, James. "The Clergy in the United States," Daedalus, XCII, No. 4 (Fall, 1963), 724-744.

Goode, W. J. "Community Within a Community," American Sociological Review, XXII (April, 1957), 194-200.

Hughes, Everett C. "Professions," Daedalus, XCII, No. 4 (Fall, 1963), 655-668.

Hughes, Everett. "The Making of a Physician," Human Organization, XIV (Winter, 1956), 21-25.

Johnson, Benton. "On Church and Sect," American Sociological Review, XXVIII, No. 4 (August, 1963), 539-549.

Johnson, C. Dale. "When Ministers Meet," Trans-Action, III, No. 4 (May/June, 1966), 31-34.

Lortie, Dan. "Laymen to Lawmen," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX, No. 4, (Fall, 1959), 352-369.

Maehr, Martin and Stake, Robert. "Value Patterns of Men Who Voluntarily Quit Seminary Training," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL, No. 6 (February, 1962), 537-540.

Merton, Robert. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," Social Forces, XVIII (1940), 560-568.

Reissman, Leonard and Platou, Ralph. "The Motivation and Socialization of Medical Students," Journal of Health and Human Behavior, I, No. 3 (Fall, 1960), 174-182.

Seeman, Melvin and Evans, John. "Apprenticeship and Attitude Change," American Journal of Sociology, LXVII, No. 4 (January, 1962), 365-378.

Selznick, Philip. "An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy," American Sociological Review, VIII, No. 1 (1943), 47-57.

Shils, Edward. "Charisma, Order and Status," American Sociological Review, XXX, No. 2 (April, 1965), 199-213.

Simpson, Ida H. "Patterns of Socialization into Professions: The Case of Student Nurses," Sociological Inquiry, XXXVII (Winter, 1967), 47-54.

Strunk, Orlo, Jr. "Theological Students; A Study in Perceived Motives," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI, No. 5 (January, 1958), 320-322.

Wardwell, Walter. "Social Integration, Bureaucratization and the Professions," Social Forces, XXXIII, No. 4 (May, 1955), 356-359.

Wilensky, Harold. "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, LXX, No. 2 (September, 1964), 137-158.

Wheeler, Stanton. "Socialization in Correctional Communities," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI, No. 5, 697-712.

Other Sources

Darling, Harold W. "A Comparative Study of Persisting and Non-Persisting Ministerial Candidates in Evangelical Colleges," Ph.D. Thesis, Purdue University, 1958. *Dissertation Abstracts*, XX (August, 1959), 586-587.

Fuller, A. D. "The Values of Social Workers," D.S.W. Thesis, University of Southern California, 1962. *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXIII, No. 12, Part I (June, 1963), p. 4779.

Hepple, L. M. *The Church in Rural Missouri*. Columbia, Mo.: A.E.S. Research Bulletin 633C, December, 1958.

Rapoport, Robert N. *Changing Navaho Religious Values*, in "Reports of the Rimrock Project, Values Series No. 2," XLI, No. 2, Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 1954.